To Lydia:
From her father.

about 1940

Alhambra, California
U.S.A.

BT
82.2
.F86
1917
V.1

The Fundamentals

A Testimony to the Truth

"To the Law and to the Testimony"
Isaiah 8:20

VOLUME I

Published by
THE BIBLE INSTITUTE OF LOS ANGELES
536-558 SOUTH HOPE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CAL.

HIEBERT LIBRARY
Fresno Pacific College - M. B. Seminary
Fresno, Calif. 93702
8071 u

Copyrighted by
Bible Institute of Los Angeles
1917

CONTENTS

VOLUME I

(The Fundamental set contains four volumes)

Chapter		Page
I.	THE HISTORY OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM..... By Canon Dyson Hague, M. A., Rector of the Memorial Church, London, Ontario. Lecturer in Liturgics and Ecclesiology, Wycliffe College, Toronto, Canada. Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Huron.	9
II.	THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH By Prof. Geo. Frederick Wright, D. D., LL. D., Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.	43
III.	FALLACIES OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM..... By Professor Franklin Johnson, D. D., LL. D.	55
IV.	THE BIBLE AND MODERN CRITICISM..... By F. Bettex, D. D., Professor Emeritus, Stuttgart, Germany. Translated from the original German, by David Heagle, D. D.	76
V.	THE HOLY SCRIPTURES AND MODERN NEGATIONS By Professor James Orr, D. D., United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland.	94
VI.	CHRIST AND CRITICISM ..... By Sir Robert Anderson, K. C. B., LL. D., Author of "The Bible and Modern Criticism," etc., London, England.	111
VII.	OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM AND NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTIANITY ..... By Professor W. H. Griffith Thomas, Wycliffe College, Toronto, Canada.	127
VIII.	THE TABERNACLE IN THE WILDERNESS: DID IT EXIST? ..... A Question Involving the Truth or Falsity of the Entire Higher Critic Theory, by David Heagle, Ph. D., D. D., Professor of Theology and Ethics, Ewing College; Translator "Bremen Lectures;" Author of "Moral Education;" "That Blessed Hope," etc.	149
IX.	INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.. By Canon G. Osborne Troop, M. A. Montreal, Canada.	193
X.	THE TESTIMONY OF CHRIST TO THE OLD TESTAMENT ..... By William Caven, D. D., LL. D., Late Principal of Knox College, Toronto, Canada.	201

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
XI.	THE EARLY NARRATIVES OF GENESIS ..... By Professor James Orr, D. D. United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland.	228
XII.	ONE ISAIAH ..... By Professor Geo. L. Robinson, D. D., McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.	241
XIII.	THE BOOK OF DANIEL ..... By Professor Joseph D. Wilson, D. D., Theological Seminary of the Reformed Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Author of "Did Daniel Write Daniel?"	259
XIV.	THE DOCTRINAL VALUE OF THE FIRST CHAPTER OF GENESIS ..... By the Rev. Dyson Hague, M. A. Vicar of the Church of the Epiphany; Professor of Liturgics, Wycliffe College, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.	272
XV.	THREE PECULIARITIES OF THE PENTATEUCH WHICH ARE INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE GRAF-WELLHAUSEN THEORIES OF ITS COMPOSITION ..... By Andrew Craig Robinson, M. A., Ballineen, County Cork, Ireland. Author of "What About the Old Testament."	288
XVI.	THE TESTIMONY OF THE MONUMENTS TO THE TRUTH OF THE SCRIPTURES..... By Prof. Geo. Frederick Wright, D. D., LL. D., Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.	293
XVII.	THE RECENT TESTIMONY OF ARCHEOLOGY TO THE SCRIPTURES ..... By M. G. Kyle, D. D., LL. D., Egyptologist. Professor of Biblical Archaeology, Xenia Theological Seminary; Consulting Editor of "The Records of the Past," Washington, D. C. (The numbers in parenthesis throughout this article refer to the notes at the end of the article.)	315
XVIII.	SCIENCE AND CHRISTIAN FAITH..... By Rev. Prof. James Orr, D. D. United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland.	334
XIX.	MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE WITH THE HIGHER CRITICISM ..... By Professor J. J. Reeve, Southwestern Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas.	348

PREFACE

In 1909 God moved two Christian laymen to set aside a large sum of money for issuing twelve volumes that would set forth the fundamentals of the Christian faith, and which were to be sent free to ministers of the gospel, missionaries, Sunday School superintendents, and others engaged in aggressive Christian work throughout the English speaking world. A committee of men who were known to be sound in the faith was chosen to have the oversight of the publication of these volumes. Rev. Dr. A. C. Dixon was the first Executive Secretary of the Committee, and upon his departure for England Rev. Dr. Louis Meyer was appointed to take his place. Upon the death of Dr. Meyer the work of the Executive Secretary devolved upon me. We were able to bring out these twelve volumes according to the original plan. Some of the volumes were sent to 300,000 ministers and missionaries and other workers in different parts of the world. On the completion of the twelve volumes as originally planned the work was continued through The King's Business, published at 536 South Hope St., Los Angeles, California. Although a larger number of volumes were issued than there were names on our mailing list, at last the stock became exhausted, but appeals for them kept coming in from different parts of the world. As the fund was no longer available for this purpose, the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, to whom the plates were turned over when the Committee closed its work, have decided to bring out the various articles that appeared in The Fundamentals in four volumes at the cheapest price possible. All the articles that appeared in The Fundamentals, with the exception of a very few that did not seem to be in exact keeping with the original purpose of The Fundamentals, will be published in this series.

R. A. TORREY,
Former Executive Secretary of the
Testimony Publishing Company.

DEDICATION

To the two laymen whose generosity made it possible to send several millions of volumes of "The Fundamentals" to ministers and missionaries in all parts of the world, for their confirmation and upbuilding in the faith, these volumes are dedicated.

THE FUNDAMENTALS

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORY OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

BY CANON DYSON HAGUE, M. A.,
RECTOR OF THE MEMORIAL CHURCH, LONDON, ONTARIO.
LECTURER IN LITURGICS AND ECCLESIOLOGY, WYCLIFFE COLLEGE, TORONTO, CANADA.
EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF HURON.

What is the meaning of the Higher Criticism? Why is it called higher? Higher than what?

At the outset it must be explained that the word "Higher" is an academic term, used in this connection in a purely special or technical sense. It is not used in the popular sense of the word at all, and may convey a wrong impression to the ordinary man. Nor is it meant to convey the idea of superiority. It is simply a term of contrast. It is used in contrast to the phrase, "Lower Criticism."

One of the most important branches of theology is called the science of Biblical criticism, which has for its object the study of the history and contents, and origins and purposes, of the various books of the Bible. In the early stages of the science Biblical criticism was devoted to two great branches, the Lower, and the Higher. The Lower Criticism was employed to designate the study of the text of the Scripture, and included the investigation of the manuscripts, and the different readings in the various versions and codices and manuscripts in order that we may be sure we have the original words as they were written by the Divinely inspired writers. (See Briggs, Hex., page 1.) The term generally used now-a-days is Textual Criticism. If the phrase were used in the twentieth century sense, Beza, Erasmus, Bengel, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorff, Scrivener, Westcott, and

Hort would be called Lower Critics. But the term is not now-a-days used as a rule. The Higher Criticism, on the contrary, was employed to designate the study of the historic origins, the dates, and authorship of the various books of the Bible, and that great branch of study which in the technical language of modern theology is known as Introduction. It is a very valuable branch of Biblical science, and is of the highest importance as an auxiliary in the interpretation of the Word of God. By its researches floods of light may be thrown on the Scriptures.

The term Higher Criticism, then, means nothing more than the study of the literary structure of the various books of the Bible, and more especially of the Old Testament. Now this in itself is most laudable. It is indispensable. It is just such work as every minister or Sunday School teacher does when he takes up his Peloubet's Notes, or his Stalker's St. Paul, or Geikie's Hours with the Bible, to find out all he can with regard to the portion of the Bible he is studying; the author, the date, the circumstances, and purpose of its writing.

WHY IS HIGHER CRITICISM IDENTIFIED WITH UNBELIEF?

How is it, then, that the Higher Criticism has become identified in the popular mind with attacks upon the Bible and the supernatural character of the Holy Scriptures?

The reason is this. No study perhaps requires so devout a spirit and so exalted a faith in the supernatural as the pursuit of the Higher Criticism. It demands at once the ability of the scholar, and the simplicity of the believing child of God. For without faith no one can explain the Holy Scriptures, and without scholarship no one can investigate historic origins.

There is a Higher Criticism that is at once reverent in tone and scholarly in work. Hengstenberg, the German, and Horne, the Englishman, may be taken as examples. Perhaps the greatest work in English on the Higher Criticism is Horne's

Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scripture. It is a work that is simply massive in its scholarship, and invaluable in its vast reach of information for the study of the Holy Scriptures. But Horne's Introduction is too large a work. It is too cumbrous for use in this hurrying age. (Carter's edition in two volumes contains 1,149 pages, and in ordinary book form would contain over 4,000 pages, i. e., about ten volumes of 400 pages each.) Latterly, however, it has been edited by Dr. Samuel Davidson, who practically adopted the views of Hupfield and Halle and interpolated not a few of the modern German theories. But Horne's work from first to last is the work of a Christian believer; constructive, not destructive; fortifying faith in the Bible, not rationalistic. But the work of the Higher Critic has not always been pursued in a reverent spirit nor in the spirit of scientific and Christian scholarship.

SUBJECTIVE CONCLUSIONS.

In the first place, the critics who were the leaders, the men who have given name and force to the whole movement, have been men who have based their theories largely upon their own subjective conclusions. They have based their conclusions largely upon the very dubious basis of the author's style and supposed literary qualifications. Everybody knows that style is a very unsafe basis for the determination of a literary product. The greater the writer the more versatile his power of expression; and anybody can understand that the Bible is the last book in the world to be studied as a mere classic by mere human scholarship without any regard to the spirit of sympathy and reverence on the part of the student. The Bible, as has been said, has no revelation to make to un-Biblical minds. It does not even follow that because a man is a philological expert he is able to understand the integrity or credibility of a passage of Holy Scripture any more than the beauty and spirit of it.

The qualification for the perception of Biblical truth is neither philosophic nor philological knowledge, but spiritual insight. The primary qualification of the musician is that he be musical; of the artist, that he have the spirit of art. So the merely technical and mechanical and scientific mind is disqualified for the recognition of the spiritual and infinite. Any thoughtful man must honestly admit that the Bible is to be treated as unique in literature, and, therefore, that the ordinary rules of critical interpretation must fail to interpret it aright.

GERMAN FANCIES.

In the second place, some of the most powerful exponents of the modern Higher Critical theories have been Germans, and it is notorious to what length the German fancy can go in the direction of the subjective and of the conjectural. For hypothesis-weaving and speculation, the German theological professor is unsurpassed. One of the foremost thinkers used to lay it down as a fundamental truth in philosophical and scientific enquiries that no regard whatever should be paid to the conjectures or hypotheses of thinkers, and quoted as an axiom the great Newton himself and his famous words, "Non fingo hypotheses": I do not frame hypotheses. It is notorious that some of the most learned German thinkers are men who lack in a singular degree the faculty of common sense and knowledge of human nature. Like many physical scientists, they are so preoccupied with a theory that their conclusions seem to the average mind curiously warped. In fact, a learned man in a letter to Descartes once made an observation which, with slight verbal alteration, might be applied to some of the German critics: "When men sitting in their closet and consulting only their books attempt disquisitions into the Bible, they may indeed tell how they would have made the Book if God had given them that commission. That is, they may describe chimeras which correspond to the fatuity of

their own minds, but without an understanding truly Divine they can never form such an idea to themselves as the Deity had in creating it." "If," says Matthew Arnold, "you shut a number of men up to make study and learning the business of their lives, how many of them, from want of some discipline or other, seem to lose all balance of judgment, all common sense."

The learned professor of Assyriology at Oxford said that the investigation of the literary source of history has been a peculiarly German pastime. It deals with the writers and readers of the ancient Orient as if they were modern German professors, and the attempt to transform the ancient Israelites into somewhat inferior German compilers, proves a strange want of familiarity with Oriental modes of thought. (Sayce, "Early History of the Hebrews," pages 108-112.)

ANTI-SUPERNATURALISTS.

In the third place, the dominant men of the movement were men with a strong bias against the supernatural. This is not an ex-parte statement at all. It is simply a matter of fact, as we shall presently show. Some of the men who have been most distinguished as the leaders of the Higher Critical movement in Germany and Holland have been men who have no faith in the God of the Bible, and no faith in either the necessity or the possibility of a personal supernatural revelation. The men who have been the voices of the movement, of whom the great majority, less widely known and less influential, have been mere echoes; the men who manufactured the articles the others distributed, have been notoriously opposed to the miraculous.

We must not be misunderstood. We distinctly repudiate the idea that all the Higher Critics were or are anti-supernaturalists. Not so. The British-American School embraces within its ranks many earnest believers. What we do say, as we will presently show, is that the dominant minds which have

led and swayed the movement, who made the theories that the others circulated, were strongly unbelieving.

Then the higher critical movement has not followed its true and original purposes in investigating the Scriptures for the purposes of confirming faith and of helping believers to understand the beauties, and appreciate the circumstances of the origin of the various books, and so understand more completely the Bible?

No. It has not; unquestionably it has not. It has been deflected from that, largely owing to the character of the men whose ability and forcefulness have given predominance to their views. It has become identified with a system of criticism which is based on hypotheses and suppositions which have for their object the repudiation of the traditional theory, and has investigated the origins and forms and styles and contents, apparently not to confirm the authenticity and credibility and reliability of the Scriptures, but to discredit in most cases their genuineness, to discover discrepancies, and throw doubt upon their authority.

THE ORIGIN OF THE MOVEMENT.

Who, then, were the men whose views have moulded the views of the leading teachers and writers of the Higher Critical school of today?

We will answer this as briefly as possible.

It is not easy to say who is the first so-called Higher Critic, or when the movement began. But it is not modern by any means. Broadly speaking, it has passed through three great stages:

1. The French-Dutch.
2. The German.
3. The British-American.

In its origin it was Franco-Dutch, and speculative, if not skeptical. The views which are now accepted as axiomatic by the Continental and British-American schools of Higher

Criticism seem to have been first hinted at by Carlstadt in 1521 in his work on the Canon of Scripture, and by Andreas Masius, a Belgian scholar, who published a commentary on Joshua in 1574, and a Roman Catholic priest, called Peyrere or Pererius, in his Systematic Theology, 1660. (LIV. Cap. i.)

But it may really be said to have originated with Spinoza, the rationalist Dutch philosopher. In his Tractatus Theologico-Politicus (Cap. vii-viii), 1670, Spinoza came out boldly and impugned the traditional date and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and ascribed the origin of the Pentateuch to Ezra or to some other late compiler.

Spinoza was really the fountain-head of the movement, and his line was taken in England by the British philosopher Hobbes. He went deeper than Spinoza, as an outspoken antagonist of the necessity and possibility of a personal revelation, and also denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. A few years later a French priest, called Richard Simon of Dieppe, pointed out the supposed varieties of style as indications of various authors in his Historical Criticism of the Old Testament, "an epoch-making work." Then another Dutchman, named Clericus (or Le Clerk), in 1685, advocated still more radical views, suggesting an Exilian and priestly authorship for the Pentateuch, and that the Pentateuch was composed by the priest sent from Babylon (2 Kings, 17), about 678, B. C., and also a kind of later editor or redactor theory. Clericus is said to have been the first critic who set forth the theory that Christ and his Apostles did not come into the world to teach the Jews criticism, and that it is only to be expected that their language would be in accordance with the views of the day.

In 1753 a Frenchman named Astruc, a medical man, and reputedly a free-thinker of profligate life, propounded for the first time the Jehovistic and Elohistic divisive hypothesis, and opened a new era. (Briggs' Higher Criticism of the

Pentateuch, page 46.) Astruc said that the use of the two names, Jehovah and Elohim, shewed the book was composed of different documents. (The idea of the Holy Ghost employing two words, or one here and another there, or both together as He wills, never seems to enter the thought of the Higher Critic!) His work was called "Conjectures Regarding the Original Memoirs in the Book of Genesis," and was published in Brussels.

Astruc may be called the father of the documentary theories. He asserted there are traces of no less than ten or twelve different memoirs in the book of Genesis. He denied its Divine authority, and considered the book to be disfigured by useless repetitions, disorder, and contradiction. (Hirschfelder, page 66.) For fifty years Astruc's theory was unnoticed. The rationalism of Germany was as yet undeveloped, so that the body was not yet prepared to receive the germ, or the soil the weed.

THE GERMAN CRITICS.

The next stage was largely German. Eichhorn is the greatest name in this period, the eminent Oriental professor at Gottingen who published his work on the Old Testament introduction in 1780. He put into different shape the documentary hypothesis of the Frenchman, and did his work so ably that his views were generally adopted by the most distinguished scholars. Eichhorn's formative influence has been incalculably great. Few scholars refused to do honor to the new sun. It is through him that the name Higher Criticism has become identified with the movement. He was followed by Vater and later by Hartmann with their fragment theory which practically undermined the Mosaic authorship, made the Pentateuch a heap of fragments, carelessly joined by one editor, and paved the way for the most radical of all divisive hypotheses.

In 1806 De Wette, Professor of Philosophy and Theology

at Heidelberg, published a work which ran through six editions in four decades. His contribution to the introduction of the Old Testament instilled the same general principles as Eichhorn, and in the supplemental hypotheses assumed that Deuteronomy was composed in the age of Josiah (2 Kings 22:8). Not long after, Vatke and Leopold George (both Hegelians) unreservedly declared the post-Mosaic and post-prophetic origin of the first four books of the Bible. Then came Bleek, who advocated the idea of the Grundschift or original document and the redactor theory; and then Ewald, the father of the Crystallization theory; and then Hupfield (1853), who held that the original document was an independent compilation; and Graf, who wrote a book on the historical books of the Old Testament in 1866 and advocated the theory that the Jehovistic and Elohistic documents were written hundreds of years after Moses' time. Graf was a pupil of Reuss, the redactor of the Ezra hypothesis of Spinoza.

Then came a most influential writer, Professor Kuenen of Leyden in Holland, whose work on the Hexateuch was edited by Colenso in 1865, and his "Religion of Israel and Prophecy in Israel," published in England in 1874-1877. Kuenen was one of the most advanced exponents of the rationalistic school. Last, but not least, of the continental Higher Critics is Julius Wellhausen, who at one time was a theological professor in Germany, who published in 1878 the first volume of his history of Israel, and won by his scholarship the attention if not the allegiance of a number of leading theologians. (See Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch, Green, pages 59-88.)

It will be observed that nearly all these authors were Germans, and most of them professors of philosophy or theology.

THE BRITISH-AMERICAN CRITICS.

The third stage of the movement is the British-American. The best known names are those of Dr. Samuel Davidson,

whose "Introduction to the Old Testament," published in 1862, was largely based on the fallacies of the German rationalists. The supplementary hypothesis passed over into England through him and with strange incongruity, he borrowed frequently from Baur. Dr. Robertson Smith, the Scotchman, recast the German theories in an English form in his works on the Pentateuch, the Prophets of Israel, and the Old Testament in the Jewish Church, first published in 1881, and followed the German school, according to Briggs, with great boldness and thoroughness. A man of deep piety and high spirituality, he combined with a sincere regard for the Word of God a critical radicalism that was strangely inconsistent, as did also his namesake, George Adam Smith, the most influential of the present-day leaders, a man of great insight and scriptural acumen, who in his works on Isaiah, and the twelve prophets, adopted some of the most radical and least demonstrable of the German theories, and in his later work, "Modern Criticism and the Teaching of the Old Testament," has gone still farther in the rationalistic direction.

Another well-known Higher Critic is Dr. S. R. Driver, the Regius professor of Hebrew at Oxford, who, in his "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," published ten years later, and his work on the Book of Genesis, has elaborated with remarkable skill and great detail of analysis the theories and views of the continental school. Driver's work is able, very able, but it lacks originality and English independence. The hand is the hand of Driver, but the voice is the voice of Kuenen or Wellhausen.

The third well-known name is that of Dr. C. A. Briggs, for some time Professor of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary of New York. An equally earnest advocate of the German theories, he published in 1883 his "Biblical Study"; in 1886, his "Messianic Prophecy," and a little later his "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch." Briggs studied

the Pentateuch, as he confesses, under the guidance chiefly of Ewald. (Hexateuch, page 63.)

Of course, this list is a very partial one, but it gives most of the names that have become famous in connection with the movement, and the reader who desires more will find a complete summary of the literature of the Higher Criticism in Professor Bissell's work on the Pentateuch (Scribner's, 1892). Briggs, in his "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch" (Scribner's, 1897), gives an historical summary also.

We must now investigate another question, and that is the religious views of the men most influential in this movement. In making the statement that we are about to make, we desire to deprecate entirely the idea of there being anything uncharitable, unfair, or unkind, in stating what is simply a matter of fact.

THE VIEWS OF THE CONTINENTAL CRITICS.

Regarding the views of the Continental Critics, three things can be confidently asserted of nearly all, if not all, of the real leaders.

1. They were men who denied the validity of miracle, and the validity of any miraculous narrative. What Christians consider to be miraculous they considered legendary or mythical; "legendary exaggeration of events that are entirely explicable from natural causes."

2. They were men who denied the reality of prophecy and the validity of any prophetical statement. What Christians have been accustomed to consider prophetical, they called dexterous conjectures, coincidences, fiction, or imposture.

3. They were men who denied the reality of revelation, in the sense in which it has ever been held by the universal Christian Church. They were avowed unbelievers of the supernatural. Their theories were excogitated on pure grounds of human reasoning. Their hypotheses were constructed on the assumption of the falsity of Scripture. As to the inspira-

tion of the Bible, as to the Holy Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation being the Word of God, they had no such belief. We may take them one by one. Spinoza repudiated absolutely a supernatural revelation. And Spinoza was one of their greatest. Eichhorn discarded the miraculous, and considered that the so-called supernatural element was an Oriental exaggeration; and Eichhorn has been called the father of Higher Criticism, and was the first man to use the term. De Wette's views as to inspiration were entirely infidel. Vatke and Leopold George were Hegelian rationalists, and regarded the first four books of the Old Testament as entirely mythical. Kuenen, says Professor Sanday, wrote in the interests of an almost avowed Naturalism. That is, he was a freethinker, an agnostic; a man who did not believe in the Revelation of the one true and living God. (Brampton Lectures, 1893, page 117.) He wrote from an avowedly naturalistic standpoint, says Driver (page 205). According to Wellhausen the religion of Israel was a naturalistic evolution from heathendom, an emanation from an imperfectly monotheistic kind of semi-pagan idolatry. It was simply a human religion.

THE LEADERS WERE RATIONALISTS.

In one word, the formative forces of the Higher Critical movement were rationalistic forces, and the men who were its chief authors and expositors, who "on account of purely philological criticism have acquired an appalling authority," were men who had discarded belief in God and Jesus Christ Whom He had sent. The Bible, in their view, was a mere human product. It was a stage in the literary evolution of a religious people. If it was not the resultant of a fortuitous concourse of Oriental myths and legendary accretions, and its Jahveh or Jahweh, the excogitation of a Sinaitic clan, it certainly was not given by the inspiration of God, and is not the Word of the living God. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," said Peter. "God, who at sundry

times and in diverse manners spake by the prophets," said Paul. Not so, said Kuenen; the prophets were not moved to speak by God. Their utterances were all their own. (Sanday, page 117.)

These then were their views and these were the views that have so dominated modern Christianity and permeated modern ministerial thought in the two great languages of the modern world. We cannot say that they were men whose rationalism was the result of their conclusions in the study of the Bible. Nor can we say their conclusions with regard to the Bible were wholly the result of their rationalism. But we can say, on the one hand, that inasmuch as they refused to recognize the Bible as a direct revelation from God, they were free to form hypotheses ad libitum. And, on the other hand, as they denied the supernatural, the animus that animated them in the construction of the hypotheses was the desire to construct a theory that would explain away the supernatural. Unbelief was the antecedent, not the consequent, of their criticism.

Now there is nothing unkind in this. There is nothing that is uncharitable, or unfair. It is simply a statement of fact which modern authorities most freely admit.

THE SCHOOL OF COMPROMISE.

When we come to the English-writing Higher Critics, we approach a much more difficult subject. The *British-American Higher Critics* represent a school of compromise. On the one hand they practically accept the premises of the Continental school with regard to the antiquity, authorship, authenticity, and origins of the Old Testament books. On the other hand, they refuse to go with the German rationalists in altogether denying their inspiration. They still claim to accept the Scriptures as containing a Revelation from God. But may they not hold their own peculiar views with regard to the origin and date and literary structure of the Bible without endangering either their own faith or the faith of Chris-

tians? This is the very heart of the question, and, in order that the reader may see the seriousness of the adoption of the conclusions of the critics, as brief a resumé as possible of the matter will be given.

THE POINT IN A NUTSHELL.

According to the faith of the universal church, the Pentateuch, that is, the first five books of the Bible, is one consistent, coherent, authentic and genuine composition, inspired by God, and, according to the testimony of the Jews, the statements of the books themselves, the reiterated corroborations of the rest of the Old Testament, and the explicit statement of the Lord Jesus (Luke 24:44, John 5:46-47) was written by Moses (with the exception, of course, of Deut. 34, possibly written by Joshua, as the Talmud states, or probably by Ezra) at a period of about fourteen centuries before the advent of Christ, and 800 years or so before Jeremiah. It is, moreover, a portion of the Bible that is of paramount importance, for it is the basic substratum of the whole revelation of God, and of paramount value, not because it is merely the literature of an ancient nation, but because it is the introductory section of the Word of God, bearing His authority and given by inspiration through His servant Moses. That is the faith of the Church.

THE CRITICS' THEORY.

But according to the Higher Critics:

1. The Pentateuch consists of four completely diverse documents. These completely different documents were the primary sources of the composition which they call the Hexateuch: (a) The Yahwist or Jahwist, (b) the Elohist, (c) the Deuteronomist, and (d) the Priestly Code, the Grundschift, the work of the first Elohist (Sayce Hist. Heb., 103), now generally known as J. E. D. P., and for convenience designated by these symbols.

2. These different works were composed at various peri-

ods of time, not in the fifteenth century, B. C., but in the ninth, seventh, sixth and fifth centuries; J. and E. being referred approximately to about 800 to 700 B. C.; D to about 650 to 625 B. C., and P. to about 525 to 425 B. C. According to the Graf theory, accepted by Kuenen, the Elohist documents were post-exilian, that is, they were written only five centuries or so before Christ. Genesis and Exodus as well as the Priestly Code, that is, Leviticus and part of Exodus and Numbers were also post-exilic.

3. These different works, moreover, represent different traditions of the national life of the Hebrews, and are at variance in most important particulars.

4. And, further. They conjecture that these four suppositive documents were not compiled and written by Moses, but were probably constructed somewhat after this fashion: For some reason, and at some time, and in some way, some one, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where, wrote J. Then someone else, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where, wrote another document, which is now called E. And then at a later time, the critics only know who, or why, or when, or where, an anonymous personage, whom we may call Redactor I, took in hand the reconstruction of these documents, introduced new material, harmonized the real and apparent discrepancies, and divided the inconsistent accounts of one event into two separate transactions. Then some time after this, perhaps one hundred years or more, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where, some anonymous personage wrote another document, which they style D. And after a while another anonymous author, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where, whom we will call Redactor II, took this in hand, compared it with J. E., revised J. E., with considerable freedom, and in addition introduced quite a body of new material. Then someone else, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where, probably, however, about 525, or

perhaps 425, wrote P.; and then another anonymous Hebrew, whom we may call Redactor III, undertook to incorporate this with the triplicated composite J. E. D., with what they call redactional additions and insertions. (Green, page 88, cf. Sayce, Early History of the Hebrews, pages 100-105.)

It may be well to state at this point that this is not an exaggerated statement of the Higher Critical position. On the contrary, we have given here what has been described as a position "established by proofs, valid and cumulative" and "representing the most sober scholarship." The more advanced continental Higher Critics, Green says, distinguish the writers of the primary sources according to the supposed elements as J1 and J2, E1 and E2, P1, P2 and P3, and D1 and D2, nine different originals in all. The different Redactors, technically described by the symbol R., are Rj., who combined J. and E.; Rd., who added D. to J. E., and Rh., who completed the Hexateuch by combining P. with J. E. D. (H. C. of the Pentateuch, page 88.)

A DISCREDITED PENTATEUCH.

5. These four suppositive documents are, moreover, alleged to be internally inconsistent and undoubtedly incomplete. How far they are incomplete they do not agree. How much is missing and when, where, how and by whom it was removed; whether it was some thief who stole, or copyist who tampered, or editor who falsified, they do not declare.

6. In this redactory process no limit apparently is assigned by the critic to the work of the redactors. With an utter irresponsibility of freedom it is declared that they inserted misleading statements with the purpose of reconciling incompatible traditions; that they amalgamated what should have been distinguished, and sundered that which should have amalgamated. In one word, it is an axiomatic principle of the divisive hypothesizers that the redactors "have not only misapprehended, but misrepresented the originals" (Green,

page 170). They were animated by "egotistical motives." They confused varying accounts, and erroneously ascribed them to different occasions. They not only gave false and colored impressions; they destroyed valuable elements of the suppositive documents and tampered with the dismantled remnant.

7. And worst of all. The Higher Critics are unanimous in the conclusion that these documents contain three species of material:

(a) The probably true.
(b) The certainly doubtful.
(c) The positively spurious.

"The narratives of the Pentateuch are usually trustworthy, though partly mythical and legendary. The miracles recorded were the exaggerations of a later age." (Davidson, Introduction, page 131.) The framework of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, says George Adam Smith in his "Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament," is woven from the raw material of myth and legend. He denies their historical character, and says that he can find no proof in archæology for the personal existence of characters of the Patriarchs themselves. Later on, however, in a fit of apologetic repentance he makes the condescending admission that it is extremely probable that the stories of the Patriarchs have at the heart of them historical elements. (Pages 90-106.)

Such is the view of the Pentateuch that is accepted as conclusive by "the sober scholarship" of a number of the leading theological writers and professors of the day. It is to this the Higher Criticism reduces what the Lord Jesus called the writings of Moses.

A DISCREDITED OLD TESTAMENT.

As to the rest of the Old Testament, it may be briefly said that they have dealt with it with an equally confusing hand.

The time-honored traditions of the Catholic Church are set at naught, and its thesis of the relation of inspiration and genuineness and authenticity derided. As to the Psalms, the harp that was once believed to be the harp of David was not handled by the sweet Psalmist of Israel, but generally by some anonymous post-exilist; and Psalms that are ascribed to David by the omnicient Lord Himself are daringly attributed to some anonymous Maccabean. Ecclesiastes, written, nobody knows when, where, and by whom, possesses just a possible grade of inspiration, though one of the critics "of cautious and well-balanced judgment" denies that it contains any at all. "Of course," says another, "it is not really the work of Solomon." (Driver, Introduction, page 470.) The Song of Songs is an idyl of human love, and nothing more. There is no inspiration in it; it contributes nothing to the sum of revelation. (Sanday, page 211.) Esther, too, adds nothing to the sum of revelation, and is not historical (page 213). Isaiah was, of course, written by a number of authors. The first part, chapters 1 to 40, by Isaiah; the second by a Deutero-Isaiah and a number of anonymous authors. As to Daniel, it was a purely pseudonymous work, written probably in the second century B. C.

With regard to the New Testament: The English writing school have hitherto confined themselves mainly to the Old Testament, but if Professor Sanday, who passes as a most conservative and moderate representative of the critical school, can be taken as a sample, the historical books are "yet in the first instance strictly histories, put together by ordinary historical methods, or, in so far as the methods on which they are composed, are not ordinary, due rather to the peculiar circumstances of the case, and not to influences, which need be specially described as supernatural" (page 399). The Second Epistle of Peter is pseudonymous, its name counterfeit, and, therefore, a forgery, just as large parts of Isaiah,

Zachariah and Jonah, and Proverbs were supposititious and quasi-fraudulent documents. This is a straightforward statement of the position taken by what is called the moderate school of Higher Criticism. It is their own admitted position, according to their own writings.

The difficulty, therefore, that presents itself to the average man of today is this: How can these critics still claim to believe in the Bible as the Christian Church has ever believed it?

A DISCREDITED BIBLE.

There can be no doubt that Christ and His Apostles accepted the whole of the Old Testament as inspired in every portion of every part; from the first chapter of Genesis to the last chapter of Malachi, all was implicitly believed to be the very Word of God Himself. And ever since their day the view of the Universal Christian Church has been that the Bible is the Word of God; as the twentieth article of the Anglican Church terms it, it is God's Word written. The Bible as a whole is inspired. "All that is written is God-inspired." That is, the Bible does not merely *contain* the Word of God; it *is* the Word of God. It contains a revelation. "All is not revealed, but all is inspired." This is the conservative and, up to the present day, the almost universal view of the question. There are, it is well known, many theories of inspiration. But whatever view or theory of inspiration men may hold, plenary, verbal, dynamical, mechanical, superintendent, or governmental, they refer either to the inspiration of the men who wrote, or to the inspiration of what is written. In one word, they imply throughout the work of God the Holy Ghost, and are bound up with the concomitant ideas of authority, veracity, reliability, and truth divine. (The two strongest works on the subject from this standpoint are by Gaussen and Lee. Gaussen on the Theopneustia is published in an American edition by Hitchcock & Walden, of

Cincinnati; and Lee on the Inspiration of Holy Scripture is published by Rivingtons. Bishop Wordsworth, on the "Inspiration of the Bible," is also very scholarly and strong. Rivingtons, 1875.)

The Bible can no longer, according to the critics, be viewed in this light. It *is* not the Word in the old sense of that term. It is not the Word of God in the sense that all of it is given by the inspiration of God. It simply *contains* the Word of God. In many of its parts it is just as uncertain as any other human book. It is not even reliable history. Its records of what it does narrate as ordinary history are full of falsifications and blunders. The origin of Deuteronomy, e. g., was "a consciously refined falsification." (See Möller, page 207.)

THE REAL DIFFICULTY.

But do they still claim to believe that the Bible is inspired? Yes. That is, in a measure. As Dr. Driver says in his preface, "Criticism in the hands of Christian scholars does not banish or destroy the inspiration of the Old Testament; it pre-supposes it." That is perfectly true. Criticism in the hands of Christian scholars is safe. But the preponderating scholarship in Old Testament criticism has admittedly *not* been in the hands of men who could be described as Christian scholars. It has been in the hands of men who disavow belief in God and Jesus Christ Whom He sent. Criticism in the hands of Horne and Hengstenberg does not banish or destroy the inspiration of the Old Testament. But, in the hands of Spinoza, and Graf, and Wellhausen, and Kuenen, inspiration is neither pre-supposed nor possible. Dr. Briggs and Dr. Smith may avow earnest avowals of belief in the Divine character of the Bible, and Dr. Driver may assert that critical conclusions do not touch either the authority or the inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, but from first to last, they treat God's Word with an indifference almost

equal to that of the Germans. They certainly handle the Old Testament as if it were ordinary literature. And in all their theories they seem like plastic wax in the hands of the rationalistic moulders. But they still claim to believe in Biblical inspiration.

A REVOLUTIONARY THEORY.

Their theory of inspiration must be, then, a very different one from that held by the average Christian.

In the Bampton Lectures for 1903, Professor Sanday of Oxford, as the exponent of the later and more conservative school of Higher Criticism, came out with a theory which he termed the inductive theory. It is not easy to describe what is fully meant by this, but it appears to mean the presence of what they call "a divine element" in certain parts of the Bible. What that really is he does not accurately declare. The language always vapours off into the vague and indefinite, whenever he speaks of it. In what books it is he does not say. "It is present in different books and parts of books in different degrees." "In some the Divine element is at the maximum; in others at the minimum." He is not always sure. He is sure it is not in Esther, in Ecclesiastes, in Daniel. If it is in the historical books, it is there as conveying a religious lesson rather than as a guarantee of historic veracity, rather as interpreting than as narrating. At the same time, if the histories as far as textual construction was concerned were "natural processes carried out naturally," it is difficult to see where the Divine or supernatural element comes in. It is an inspiration which seems to have been devised as a hypothesis of compromise. In fact, it is a tenuous, equivocal, and indeterminate something, the amount of which is as indefinite as its quality. (Sanday, pages 100-398; cf. Driver, Preface, ix.)

But its most serious feature is this: It is a theory of inspiration that completely overturns the old-fashioned ideas of the Bible and its unquestioned standard of authority and

truth. For whatever this so-called Divine element is, it appears to be quite consistent with defective argument, incorrect interpretation, if not what the average man would call forgery or falsification.

It is, in fact, revolutionary. To accept it the Christian will have to completely readjust his ideas of honor and honesty, of falsehood and misrepresentation. Men used to think that forgery was a crime, and falsification a sin. Pusey, in his great work on Daniel, said that "to write a book under the name of another and to give it out to be his is in any case a forgery, dishonest in itself and destructive of all trustworthiness." (Pusey, Lectures on Daniel, page 1.) But according to the Higher Critical position, all sorts of pseudonymous material, and not a little of it believed to be true by the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, is to be found in the Bible, and no antecedent objection ought to be taken to it.

Men used to think that inaccuracy would affect reliability and that proven inconsistencies would imperil credibility. But now it appears that there may not only be mistakes and errors on the part of copyists, but forgeries, intentional omissions, and misinterpretations on the part of authors, and yet, marvelous to say, faith is not to be destroyed, but to be placed on a firmer foundation. (Sanday, page 122.) They have, according to Briggs, enthroned the Bible in a higher position than ever before. (Briggs, "The Bible, Church and Reason," page 149.) Sanday admits that there is an element in the Pentateuch derived from Moses himself. An element! But he adds, "However much we may believe that there is a genuine Mosaic foundation in the Pentateuch, it is difficult to lay the finger upon it, and to say with confidence, here Moses himself is speaking." "The strictly Mosaic element in the Pentateuch must be indeterminate." "We ought not, perhaps, to use them (the visions of Ex. 3 and 33) without reserve for Moses himself" (pages 172-174-176). The ordi-

nary Christian, however, will say: Surely if we deny the Mosaic authorship and the unity of the Pentateuch we must undermine its credibility. The Pentateuch claims to be Mosaic. It was the universal tradition of the Jews. It is expressly stated in nearly all the subsequent books of the Old Testament. The Lord Jesus said so most explicitly. (John 5:46-47.)

IF NOT MOSES, WHO?

For this thought must surely follow to the thoughtful man: If Moses did not write the Books of Moses, who did?

If there were three or four, or six, or nine authorized original writers, why not fourteen, or sixteen, or nineteen? And then another and more serious thought must follow that. Who were these original writers, and who originated them? If there were manifest evidences of alterations, manipulations, inconsistencies and omissions by an indeterminate number of unknown and unknowable and undateable redactors, then the question arises, who were these redactors, and how far had they authority to redact, and who gave them this authority? If the redactor was the writer, was he an inspired writer, and if he was inspired, what was the degree of his inspiration; was it partial, plenary, inductive or indeterminate? This is a question of questions: What is the guarantee of the inspiration of the redactor, and who is its guarantor? Moses we know, and Samuel we know, and Daniel we know, but ye anonymous and pseudonymous, who are ye? The Pentateuch, with Mosaic authorship, as Scriptural, divinely accredited, is upheld by Catholic tradition and scholarship, and appeals to reason. But a mutilated cento or scrap-book of anonymous compilations, with its pre- and post-exilic redactors and redactions, is confusion worse confounded.

At least that is the way it appears to the average Christian. He may not be an expert in philosophy or theology, but his common sense must surely be allowed its rights. And

that is the way it appears, too, to such an illustrious scholar and critic as Dr. Emil Reich. (Contemporary Review, April, 1905, page 515.)

It is not possible then to accept the Kuenen-Wellhausen theory of the structure of the Old Testament and the Sanday-Driver theory of its inspiration without undermining faith in the Bible as the Word of God. For the Bible is either the Word of God, or it is not. The children of Israel were the children of the Only Living and True God, or they were not. If their Jehovah was a mere tribal deity, and their religion a human evolution; if their sacred literature was natural with mythical and pseudonymous admixtures; then the Bible is dethroned from its throne as the exclusive, authoritative, Divinely inspired Word of God. It simply ranks as one of the sacred books of the ancients with similar claims of inspiration and revelation. Its inspiration is an indeterminate quantity and any man has a right to subject it to the judgment of his own critical insight, and to receive just as much of it as inspired as he or some other person believes to be inspired. When the contents have passed through the sieve of his judgment the inspired residuum may be large, or the inspired residuum may be small. If he is a conservative critic it may be fairly large, a maximum; if he is a more advanced critic it may be fairly small, a minimum. It is simply the ancient literature of a religious people containing somewhere the Word of God; "a revelation of no one knows what, made no one knows how, and lying no one knows where, except that it is to be somewhere between Genesis and Revelation, but probably to the exclusion of both." (Pusey, Daniel, xxviii.)

NO FINAL AUTHORITY.

Another serious consequence of the Higher Critical movement is that it threatens the Christian system of doctrine and the whole fabric of systematic theology. For up to the present time any text from any part of the Bible was accepted as

a proof-text for the establishment of any truth of Christian teaching, and a statement from the Bible was considered an end of controversy. The doctrinal systems of the Anglican, the Presbyterian, the Methodist and other Churches are all based upon the view that the Bible contains the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. (See 39 Articles Church of England, vi, ix, xx, etc.) They accept as an axiom that the Old and New Testaments in part, and as a whole, have been given and sealed by God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. All the doctrines of the Church of Christ, from the greatest to the least, are based on this. All the proofs of the doctrines are based also on this. No text was questioned; no book was doubted; all Scripture was received by the great builders of our theological systems with that unassailable belief in the inspiration of its texts, which was the position of Christ and His apostles.

But now the Higher Critics think they have changed all that.

They claim that the science of criticism has dispossessed the science of systematic theology. Canon Henson tells us that the day has gone by for proof-texts and harmonies. It is not enough now for a theologian to turn to a book in the Bible, and bring out a text in order to establish a doctrine. It might be in a book, or in a portion of the Book that the German critics have proved to be a forgery, or an anachronism. It might be in Deuteronomy, or in Jonah, or in Daniel, and in that case, of course, it would be out of the question to accept it. The Christian system, therefore, will have to be re-adjusted if not revolutionized, every text and chapter and book will have to be inspected and analyzed in the light of its date, and origin, and circumstances, and authorship, and so on, and only after it has passed the examining board of the modern Franco-Dutch-German criticism will it be allowed to stand as a proof-text for the establishment of any Christian doctrine.

But the most serious consequence of this theory of the structure and inspiration of the Old Testament is that it overturns the juridic authority of our Lord Jesus Christ.

WHAT OF CHRIST'S AUTHORITY?

The attitude of Christ to the Old Testament Scriptures must determine ours. He is God. He is truth. His is the final voice. He is the Supreme Judge. There is no appeal from that court. Christ Jesus the Lord believed and affirmed the historic veracity of the whole of the Old Testament writings implicitly (Luke 24:44). And the Canon, or collection of Books of the Old Testament, was precisely the same in Christ's time as it is today. And further. Christ Jesus our Lord believed and emphatically affirmed the Mosaic authorsip of the Pentateuch (Matt. 5:17-18; Mark 12:26-36; Luke 16:31; John 5:46-47). That is true, the critics say. But, then, neither Christ nor His Apostles were critical scholars! Perhaps not in the twentieth century sense of the term. But, as a German scholar said, if they were not critici doctores, they were doctores veritatis who did not come into the world to fortify popular errors by their authority. But then they say, Christ's knowledge as man was limited. He grew in knowledge (Luke 2:52). Surely that implies His ignorance. And if His ignorance, why not His ignorance with regard to the science of historical criticism? (Gore, Lux Mundi, page 360; Briggs, H. C. of Hexateuch, page 28.) Or even if He did know more than His age, He probably spoke as He did in accommodation with the ideas of His contemporaries! (Briggs, page 29.)

In fact, what they mean is practically that Jesus did know perfectly well that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, but allowed His disciples to believe that Moses did, and taught His disciples that Moses did, simply because He did not want to upset their simple faith in the whole of the Old Testament as the actual and authoritative and Divinely revealed Word

of God. (See Driver, page 12.) Or else, that Jesus imagined, like any other Jew of His day, that Moses wrote the books that bear his name, and believed, with the childlike Jewish belief of His day, the literal inspiration, Divine authority and historic veracity of the Old Testament, and yet was completely mistaken, ignorant of the simplest facts, and wholly in error. In other words, He could not tell a forgery from an original, or a pious fiction from a genuine document. (The analogy of Jesus speaking of the sun rising as an instance of the theory of accommodation is a very different thing.)

This, then, is their position: Christ knew the views He taught were false, and yet taught them as truth. Or else, Christ didn't know they were false and believed them to be true when they were not true. In either case the Blessed One is dethroned as True God and True Man. If He did not know the books to be spurious when they were spurious and the fables and myths to be mythical and fabulous; if He accepted legendary tales as trustworthy facts, then He was not and is not omniscient. He was not only intellectually fallible, He was morally fallible; for He was not true enough "to miss the ring of truth" in Deuteronomy and Daniel.

And further. If Jesus did know certain of the books to be lacking in genuineness, if not spurious and pseudonymous; if He did know the stories of the Fall and Lot and Abraham and Jonah and Daniel to be allegorical and imaginary, if not unverifiable and mythical, then He was neither trustworthy nor good. "If it were not so, I would have told you." We feel, those of us who love and trust Him, that if these stories were not true, if these books were a mass of historical unveracities, if Abraham was an eponymous hero, if Joseph was an astral myth, that He would have told us so. It is a matter that concerned His honor as a Teacher as well as His knowledge as our God. As Canon Liddon has conclusively pointed out, if our Lord was unreliable in these historic and

documentary matters of inferior value, how can He be followed as the teacher of doctrinal truth and the revealer of God? (John 3:12.) (Liddon, Divinity of Our Lord, pages 475-480.)

AFTER THE KENOSIS.

Men say in this connection that part of the humiliation of Christ was His being touched with the infirmities of our human ignorance and fallibilities. They dwell upon the so-called doctrine of the Kenosis, or the emptying, as explaining satisfactorily His limitations. But Christ spoke of the Old Testament Scriptures after His resurrection. He affirmed after His glorious resurrection that "all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Me" (Luke 24:44). This was not a statement made during the time of the Kenosis, when Christ was a mere boy, or a youth, or a mere Jew after the flesh (1 Cor. 13:11). It is the statement of Him Who has been declared the Son of God with power. It is the Voice that is final and overwhelming. The limitations of the Kenosis are all abandoned now, and yet the Risen Lord not only does not give a shadow of a hint that any statement in the Old Testament is inaccurate or that any portion thereof needed revision or correction, not only most solemnly declared that those books which we receive as the product of Moses were indeed the books of Moses, but authorized with His Divine imprimatur the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures from beginning to end.

There are, however, two or three questions that must be raised, as they will have to be faced by every student of present day problems. The first is this: Is not refusal of the higher critical conclusions mere opposition to light and progress and the position of ignorant alarmists and obscurantists?

NOT OBSCURANTISTS.

It is very necessary to have our minds made perfectly clear on this point, and to remove not a little dust of misunderstanding.

The desire to receive all the light that the most fearless search for truth by the highest scholarship can yield is the desire of every true believer in the Bible. No really healthy Christian mind can advocate obscurantism. The obscurant who opposes the investigation of scholarship, and would throttle the investigators, has not the spirit of Christ. In heart and attitude he is a Mediævalist. To use Bushnell's famous apologue, he would try to stop the dawning of the day by wringing the neck of the crowing cock. No one wants to put the Bible in a glass case. But it is the duty of every Christian who belongs to the noble army of truth-lovers to test all things and to hold fast that which is good. He also has rights even though he is, technically speaking, unlearned, and to accept any view that contradicts his spiritual judgment simply because it is that of a so-called scholar, is to abdicate his franchise as a Christian and his birthright as a man. (See that excellent little work by Professor Kennedy, "Old Testament Criticism and the Rights of the Unlearned," F. H. Revell.) And in his right of private judgment he is aware that while the privilege of investigation is conceded to all, the conclusions of an avowedly prejudiced scholarship must be subjected to a peculiarly searching analysis. The most ordinary Bible reader is learned enough to know that the investigation of the Book that claims to be supernatural by those who are avowed enemies of all that is supernatural, and the study of subjects that can be understood only by men of humble and contrite heart by men who are admittedly irreverent in spirit, must certainly be received with caution. (See Parker's striking work, "None Like It," F. H. Revell, and his last address.)

THE SCHOLARSHIP ARGUMENT.

The second question is also serious: Are we not bound to receive these views when they are advanced, not by rationalists, but by Christians, and not by ordinary Christians, but by men of superior and unchallengeable scholarship?

There is a widespread idea among younger men that the so-called Higher Critics must be followed because their scholarship settles the questions. This is a great mistake. No expert scholarship can settle questions that require a humble heart, a believing mind and a reverent spirit, as well as a knowledge of Hebrew and philology; and no scholarship can be relied upon as expert which is manifestly characterized by a biased judgment, a curious lack of knowledge of human nature, and a still more curious deference to the views of men with a prejudice against the supernatural. No one can read such a suggestive and sometimes even such an inspiring writer as George Adam Smith without a feeling of sorrow that he has allowed this German bias of mind to lead him into such an assumption of infallibility in many of his positions and statements. It is the same with Driver. With a kind of sic volo sic jubeo airy ease he introduces assertions and propositions that would really require chapter after chapter, if not even volume after volume, to substantiate. On page after page his "must be," and "could not possibly be," and "could certainly not," extort from the average reader the natural exclamation: "But why?" "Why not?" "Wherefore?" "On what grounds?" "For what reason?" "Where are the proofs?" But of proofs or reason there is not a trace. The reader must be content with the writer's assertions. It reminds one, in fact, of the "we may well suppose," and "perhaps" of the Darwinian who offers as the sole proof of the origination of a different species his random supposition! ("Modern Ideas of Evolution," Dawson, pages 53-55.)

A GREAT MISTAKE.

There is a widespread idea also among the younger students that because Graf and Wellhausen and Driver and Cheyne are experts in Hebrew that, therefore, their deductions as experts in language must be received. This, too, is a mistake. There is no such difference in the Hebrew of the so-called original sources of the Hexateuch as some suppose. The argument from language, says Professor Bissell ("Introduction to Genesis in Colors," page vii), requires extreme care for obvious reasons. There is no visible cleavage line among the supposed sources. Any man of ordinary intelligence can see at once the vast difference between the English of Tennyson and Shakespeare, and Chaucer and Sir John de Mandeville. But no scholar in the world ever has or ever will be able to tell the dates of each and every book in the Bible by the style of the Hebrew. (See Sayce, "Early History of the Hebrews," page 109.) The unchanging Orient knows nothing of the swift lingual variations of the Occident. Pusey, with his masterly scholarship, has shown how even the Book of Daniel, from the standpoint of philology, cannot possibly be a product of the time of the Maccabees. ("On Daniel," pages 23-59.) The late Professor of Hebrew in the University of Toronto, Professor Hirschfelder, in his very learned work on Genesis, says: "We would search in vain for any peculiarity either in the language or the sense that woud indicate a two-fold authorship." As far as the language of the original goes, "the most fastidious critic could not possibly detect the slightest peculiarity that would indicate it to be derived from two sources" (page 72). Dr. Emil Reich also, in his "Bankruptcy of the Higher Criticism," in the Contemporary Review, April, 1905, says the same thing.

NOT ALL ON ONE SIDE.

A third objection remains, a most serious one. It is that all the scholarship is on one side. The old-fashioned conserva-

tive views are no longer maintained by men with pretension to scholarship. The only people who oppose the Higher Critical views are the ignorant, the prejudiced, and the illiterate. (Briggs' "Bible, Church and Reason," pages 240-247.)

This, too, is a matter that needs a little clearing up. In the first place it is not fair to assert that the upholders of what are called the old-fashioned or traditional views of the Bible are opposed to the pursuit of scientific Biblical investigation. It is equally unfair to imagine that their opposition to the views of the Continental school is based upon ignorance and prejudice.

What the Conservative school oppose is not Biblical criticism, but Biblical criticism by rationalists. They do not oppose the conclusions of Wellhausen and Kuenen because they are experts and scholars; they oppose them because the Biblical criticism of rationalists and unbelievers can be neither expert nor scientific. A criticism that is characterized by the most arbitrary conclusions from the most spurious assumptions has no right to the word scientific. And further. Their adhesion to the traditional views is not only conscientious but intelligent. They believe that the old-fashioned views are as scholarly as they are Scriptural. It is the fashion in some quarters to cite the imposing list of scholars on the side of the German school, and to sneeringly assert that there is not a scholar to stand up for the old views of the Bible.

This is not the case. Hengstenberg of Basle and Berlin, was as profound a scholar as Eichhorn, Vater or De Wette; and Keil or Kurtz, and Zahn and Rupprecht were competent to compete with Reuss and Kuenen. Wilhelm Möller, who confesses that he was once "immovably convinced of the irrefutable correctness of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis," has revised his former radical conclusions on the ground of reason and deeper research as a Higher Critic; and Professor Winckler, who has of late overturned the assured and settled results of the Higher Critics from the foundations, is,

according to Orr, the leading Orientalist in Germany, and a man of enormous learning.

Sayce, the Professor of Assyriology at Oxford, has a right to rank as an expert and scholar with Cheyne, the Oriel Professor of Scripture Interpretation. Margoliouth, the Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford, as far as learning is concerned, is in the same rank with Driver, the Regius Professor of Hebrew, and the conclusion of this great scholar with regard to one of the widely vaunted theories of the radical school, is almost amusing in its terseness.

"Is there then nothing in the splitting theories," he says in summarizing a long line of defense of the unity of the book of Isaiah; "is there then nothing in the splitting theories? To my mind, *nothing at all!*" ("Lines of Defense," page 136.)

Green and Bissell are as able, if not abler, scholars than Robertson Smith and Professor Briggs, and both of these men, as a result of the widest and deepest research, have come to the conclusion that the theories of the Germans are unscientific, unhistorical, and unscholarly. The last words of Professor Green in his very able work on the "Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch" are most suggestive. "Would it not be wiser for them to revise their own ill-judged alliance with the enemies of evangelical truth, and inquire whether Christ's view of the Old Testament may not, after all, be the true view?"

Yes. That, after all, is the great and final question. We trust we are not ignorant. We feel sure we are not malignant. We desire to treat no man unfairly, or set down aught in malice.

But we desire to stand with Christ and His Church. If we have any prejudice, we would rather be prejudiced against rationalism. If we have any bias, it must be against a teaching which unsteadies heart and unsettles faith. Even at the expense of being thought behind the times, we prefer to

stand with our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in receiving the Scriptures as the Word of God, without objection and without a doubt. A little learning, and a little listening to rationalistic theorizers and sympathizers may incline us to uncertainty; but deeper study and deeper research will incline us as it inclined Hengstenberg and Möller, to the profoundest conviction of the authority and authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, and to cry, "Thy word is very pure; therefore Thy servant loveth it."

CHAPTER II

THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE FREDERICK WRIGHT, D. D., LL. D.,
OBERLIN COLLEGE, OBERLIN, OHIO

During the last quarter of a century an influential school of critics has deluged the world with articles and volumes attempting to prove that the Pentateuch did not originate during the time of Moses, and that most of the laws attributed to him did not come into existence until several centuries after his death, and many of them not till the time of Ezekiel. By these critics the patriarchs are relegated to the realm of myth or dim legend and the history of the Pentateuch generally is discredited. In answering these destructive contentions and defending the history which they discredit we can do no better than to give a brief summary of the arguments of Mr. Harold M. Wiener, a young orthodox Jew, who is both a well established barrister in London, and a scholar of the widest attainments. What he has written upon the subject during the last ten years would fill a thousand octavo pages; while our condensation must be limited to less than twenty. In approaching the subject it comes in place to consider

I. THE BURDEN OF PROOF

The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch has until very recent times been accepted without question by both Jews and Christians. Such acceptance, coming down to us in unbroken line from the earliest times of which we have any information, gives it the support of what is called general consent, which, while perhaps not absolutely conclusive, compels those who would discredit it to produce incontrovertible opposing evidence. But the evidence which the critics produce

in this case is wholly circumstantial, consisting of inferences derived from a literary analysis of the documents and from the application of a discredited evolutionary theory concerning the development of human institutions.

II. FAILURE OF THE ARGUMENT FROM LITERARY ANALYSIS

(a) *Evidence of Textual Criticism.*

It is an instructive commentary upon the scholarly pretensions of this whole school of critics that, without adequate examination of the facts, they have based their analysis of the Pentateuch upon the text which is found in our ordinary Hebrew Bibles. While the students of the New Testament have expended an immense amount of effort in the comparison of manuscripts, and versions, and quotations to determine the original text, these Old Testament critics have done scarcely anything in that direction. This is certainly a most unscholarly proceeding, yet it is admitted to be the fact by a higher critic of no less eminence than Principal J. Skinner of Cambridge, England, who has been compelled to write: "I do not happen to know of any work which deals exhaustively with the subject, the determination of the original Hebrew texts from the critical standpoints."

Now the fact is that while the current Hebrew text, known as the Massoretic, was not established until about the seventh century A. D., we have abundant material with which to compare it and carry us back to that current a thousand years nearer the time of the original composition of the books. (1) The Greek translation known as the Septuagint was made from Hebrew manuscripts current two or three centuries before the Christian era. It is from this version that most of the quotations in the New Testament are made. Of the 350 quotations from the Old Testament in the New, 300, while differing more or less from the Massoretic text, do not differ materially from the Septuagint. (2) The

Samaritans early broke away from the Jews and began the transmission of a Hebrew text of the Pentateuch on an independent line which has continued down to the present day. (3) Besides this three other Greek versions were made long before the establishment of the Massoretic text. The most important of these was one by Aquila, who was so punctilious that he transliterated the word Jehovah in the old Hebrew characters, instead of translating it by the Greek word meaning Lord as was done in the Septuagint. (4) Early Syriac material often provides much information concerning the original Hebrew text. (5) The translation into Latin known as the Vulgate preceded the Massoretic text by some centuries, and was made by Jerome, who was noted as a Hebrew scholar. But Augustine thought it sacrilegious not to be content with the Septuagint.

All this material furnishes ample ground for correcting in minor particulars the current Hebrew text; and this can be done on well established scientific principles which largely eliminate conjectural emendations. This argument has been elaborated by a number of scholars, notably by Dahse, one of the most brilliant of Germany's younger scholars, first in the *"Archiv fuer Religions-Wissenschaft"* for 1903, pp. 305-319, and again in an article which will appear in the *"Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift"* for this year; and he is following up his attack on the critical theories with an important book entitled, *"Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage,"* which will shortly be published in Germany. Although so long a time has elapsed since the publication of his first article on the subject, and in spite of the fact that it attracted world-wide attention and has often been referred to since, no German critic has yet produced an answer to it. In England and America Dr. Redpath and Mr. Wiener have driven home the argument. (See Wiener's "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism", and "Origin of the Pentateuch.")

On bringing the light of this evidence to bear upon the

subject some remarkable results are brought out, the most important of which relate to the very foundation upon which the theories concerning the fragmentary character of the Pentateuch are based. The most prominent clue to the documentary division is derived from the supposed use by different writers of the two words, "Jehovah" and "Elohim," to designate the deity. Jehovah was translated in the Septuagint by a word meaning "Lord", which appears in our authorized version in capitalized form, "LORD." The revisers of 1880, however, have simply transliterated the word, so that "Jehovah" usually appears in the revision wherever "LORD" appeared in the authorized version. Elohim is everywhere translated by the general word for deity, "God."

Now the original critical division into documents was made on the supposition that several hundred years later than Moses there arose two schools of writers, one of which, in Judah, used the word "Jehovah" when they spoke of the deity, and the other, in the Northern Kingdom, "Elohim." And so the critics came to designate one set of passages as belonging to the J document and the other to the E document. These they supposed had been cut up and pieced together by a later editor so as to make the existing continuous narrative. But when, as frequently occurred, one of these words is found in passages where it is thought the other word should have been used, it is supposed, wholly on theoretical grounds, that a mistake had been made by the editor, or, as they call him, the "redactor," and so with no further ceremony the objection is arbitrarily removed without consulting the direct textual evidence.

But upon comparing the early texts, versions, and quotations it appears that the words, "Jehovah" and "Elohim," were so nearly synonymous that there was originally little uniformity in their use. Jehovah is the Jewish *name* of the deity, and Elohim the *title*. The use of the words is precisely like that of the English in referring to their king or the

Americans to their president. In ordinary usage, "George V.", "the king," and "King George" are synonymous in their meaning. Similarly "Taft," "the president," and "President Taft" are used by Americans during his term of office to indicate an identical concept. So it was with the Hebrews. "Jehovah" was the name, "Elohim" the title, and "Jehovah Elohim"—Lord God—signified nothing more. Now on consulting the evidence it appears that while in Genesis and the first three chapters of Exodus (where this clue was supposed to be most decisive) Jehovah occurs in the Hebrew text 148 times, in 118 of these places other texts have either Elohim or Jehovah Elohim. In the same section, while Elohim alone occurs 179 times in the Hebrew, in 49 of the passages one or the other designation takes its place; and in the second and third chapters of Genesis where the Hebrew text has Jehovah Elohim (LORD God) 23 times, there is only one passage in which all the texts are unanimous on this point.

These facts, which are now amply verified, utterly destroy the value of the clue which the higher critics have all along ostentatiously put forward to justify their division of the Pentateuch into conflicting E and J documents, and this the critics themselves are now compelled to admit. The only answer which they are able to give is in Dr. Skinner's words that the analysis is correct even if the clue which led to it be false, adding "even if it were proved to be so altogether fallacious, it would not be the first time that a wrong clue has led to true results."

On further examination, in the light of present knowledge (as Wiener and Dahse abundantly show), legitimate criticism removes a large number of the alleged difficulties which are put forward by higher critics and renders of no value many of the supposed clues to the various documents. We have space to notice but one or two of these. In the Massoretic text of Ex. 18:6 we read that Jethro says to Moses, "I thy father-in-law Jethro am come," while in the seventh

verse it is said that Moses goes out to meet his father-in-law and that they exchange greetings and then come into the tent. But how could Jethro speak to Moses before they had had a meeting? The critics say that this confusion arises from the bungling patchwork of an editor who put two discordant accounts together without attempting to cover up the discrepancy. But scientific textual criticism completely removes the difficulty. The Septuagint, the old Syriac version, and a copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch, instead of "I thy father-in-law Jethro am come", read, "And one said unto Moses, *behold* thy father-in-law Jethro" comes. Here the corruption of a single letter in the Hebrew gives us "behold" in place of "I". When this is observed the objection disappears entirely.

Again, in Gen. 39:20-22 Joseph is said to have been put into the prison "where the king's prisoners were bound. . . . And the *keeper of the prison*" promoted him. But in chapter 40:2-4, 7 it is said that he was "in ward of the house of the *captain of the guard* . . . and the captain of the guard" promoted Joseph. But this discrepancy disappears as soon as an effort is made to determine the original text. In Hebrew, "keeper of the prison" and "captain of the guard" both begin with the same word and in the passages where the "captain of the guard" causes trouble by its appearance, the Septuagint either omitted the phrase or read "keeper of the prison," in one case being supported also by the Vulgate.

In many other instances also, attention to the original text removes the difficulties which have been manufactured from apparent discrepancies in the narrative.

(b) Delusions of Literary Analysis.

But even on the assumption of the practical inerrancy of the Massoretic text the arguments against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch drawn from the literary analysis are seen to be the result of misdirected scholarship, and to be utterly fallacious. The long lists of words adduced as charac-

teristic of the writers to whom the various parts of the Pentateuch are assigned are readily seen to be occasioned by the different objects aimed at in the portions from which the lists are made.

Here, however, it is necessary to add that besides the E and J documents the critics suppose that Deuteronomy, which they designate "D", is an independent literary production written in the time of Josiah. Furthermore, the critics pretend to have discovered by their analysis another document which they call the Priestly Code and designate as "P". This provides the groundwork of most of the narrative, and comprises the entire ceremonial portion of the law. This document, which, according to these critics did not come into existence till the time of Ezekiel, largely consists of special instructions to priests telling them how they were to perform the sacrifices and public ceremonials, and how they were to determine the character of contagious diseases and unsanitary conditions. Such instructions are necessarily made up largely of technical language such as is found in the libraries of lawyers and physicians, and it is easy enough to select from such literature a long list of words which are not to be found in contemporary literature dealing with the ordinary affairs of life and aiming directly at elevating the tone of morality and stimulating devotion to higher spiritual ends. Furthermore, an exhaustive examination (made by Chancellor Lias) of the entire list of words found in this P document attributed to the time of Ezekiel shows absolutely no indication of their belonging to an age later than that of Moses.

The absurdity of the claims of the higher critics to having established the existence of different documents in the Pentateuch by a literary analysis has been shown by a variety of examples. The late Professor C. M. Mead, the most influential of the American revisers of the translation of the Old Testament, in order to exhibit the fallacy of their procedure, took the Book of Romans and arbitrarily divided it into three

parts, according as the words "Christ Jesus," "Jesus," or "God" were used; and then by analysis showed that the lists of peculiar words characteristic of these three passages were even more remarkable than those drawn up by the destructive critics of the Pentateuch from the three leading fragments into which they had divided it. The argument from literary analysis after the methods of these critics would prove the composite character of the Epistle to the Romans as fully as that of the critics would prove the composite character of the Pentateuch. A distinguished scholar, Dr. Hayman, formerly head-master of Rugby, by a similar analysis demonstrated the composite character of Robert Burns' little poem addressed to a mouse, half of which is in the purest English and the other half in the broadest Scotch dialect. By the same process it would be easy to prove three Macaulays and three Miltons by selecting lists of words from the documents prepared by them when holding high political offices and from their various prose and poetical writings.

III. MISUNDERSTANDING LEGAL FORMS AND THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM

Another source of fallacious reasoning into which these critics have fallen arises from a misunderstanding of the sacrificial system of the Mosaic law. The destructive critics assert that there was no central sanctuary in Palestine until several centuries after its occupation under Joshua, and that at a later period all sacrifices by the people were forbidden except at the central place when offered by the priests, unless it was where there had been a special theophany. But these statements evince an entire misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the facts. In what the critics reckon as the oldest documents (J and E) the people were required three times a year to present themselves with sacrifices and offerings *"at the house of the Lord"* (Ex. 34:26; 23:19). Before the building of the temple this "house of the Lord was at Shiloh"

(Josh. 18:1; Judges 18:31; 1 Sam. 2:24). The truth is that the destructive critics upon this point make a most humiliating mistake in repeatedly substituting "sanctuaries" for "altars," assuming that since there was a plurality of altars in the time of the Judges there was therefore a plurality of sanctuaries. They have completely misunderstood the permission given in Ex. 20:24: "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen; in all places, A. V.; [in every place, R. V.], where I record My name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee. And if thou make Me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stones." In reading this passage we are likely to be misled by the erroneous translation. Where the revisers read in "every place" and the authorized version in "all places" the correct translation is "in all the place" or "in the whole place." The word is in the singular number and has a definite article before it. The whole place referred to is Palestine, the Holy Land, where sacrifices such as the patriarchs had offered were always permitted to laymen, provided they made use only of an altar of earth or unhewn stones which was kept free from the adornments and accessories characteristic of heathen altars. These lay sacrifices were recognized in Deuteronomy as well as in Exodus. (Deut. 16:21.) But altars of earth or unhewn stone, often used for the nonce only and having no connection with a temple of any sort, are not houses of God and will not become such on being called sanctuaries by critics several thousand years after they have fallen out of use.

In accordance with this command and permission the Jews have always limited their sacrifices to the land of Palestine. When exiled to foreign lands the Jews to this day have ceased to offer sacrifices. It is true that an experiment was made of setting up a sacrificial system in Egypt for a time by a certain portion of the exiles; but this was soon abandoned. Ultimately a synagogue system was established and worship

outside of Palestine was limited to prayer and the reading of Scriptures.

But besides the lay sacrifices which were continued from the patriarchal times and guarded against perversion, there were two other classes of offerings established by statute; namely, those individual offerings which were brought to the "house of God" at the central place of worship and offered with priestly assistance, and the national offerings described in Numbers 28ff. which were brought on behalf of the whole people and not of an individual. A failure to distinguish clearly between these three classes of sacrifices has led the critics into endless confusion, and error has arisen from their inability to understand legal terms and principles. The Pentateuch is not mere literature, but it contains a legal code. It is a product of statesmanship consisting of three distinct elements which have always been recognized by lawgivers; namely, the civil, the moral, and the ceremonial, or what Wiener calls the "jural laws," the "moral code" and "procedure." The jural laws are those the infractions of which can be brought before a court, such as "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's landmark." But "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" can be enforced only by public sentiment and Divine sanctions. The Book of Deuteronomy is largely occupied with the presentation of exhortations and motives, aiming to secure obedience to a higher moral code, and is in this largely followed by the prophets of the Old Dispensation and the preachers of the present day. The moral law supplements the civil law. The ceremonial law consists of directions to the priests for performing the various technical duties, and were of as little interest to the mass of people as are the legal and medical books of the present time. All these strata of the law were naturally and necessarily in existence at the same time. In putting them as successive strata, with the ceremonial law last, the critics have made an egregious and misleading blunder.

IV. THE POSITIVE EVIDENCE

Before proceeding to give in conclusion a brief summary of the circumstantial evidence supporting the ordinary belief in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch it is important to define the term. By it we do not mean that Moses wrote *all* the Pentateuch with his own hand, or that there were *no* editorial additions made after his death. Moses was the author of the Pentateuchal Code, as Napoleon was of the code which goes under his name. Apparently the Book of Genesis is largely made up from existing documents, of which the history of the expedition of Amraphel in chapter 14 is a noted specimen; while the account of Moses' death, and a few other passages are evidently later editorial additions. But these are not enough to affect the general proposition. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is supported by the following, among other weighty considerations:

1. The Mosaic era was a literary epoch in the world's history when such codes were common. It would have been strange if such a leader had not produced a code of laws. The Tel-el-Amarna tablets and the Code of Hammurabi testify to the literary habits of the time.

2. The Pentateuch so perfectly reflects the conditions in Egypt at the period assigned to it that it is difficult to believe that it was a literary product of a later age.

3. Its representation of life in the wilderness is so perfect and so many of its laws are adapted only to that life that it is incredible that literary men a thousand years later should have imagined it.

4. The laws themselves bear indubitable marks of adaptation to the stage of national development to which they are ascribed. It was the study of Maine's works on ancient law that set Mr. Wiener out upon his re-investigation of the subject.

5. The little use that is made of the sanctions of a future

life is, as Bishop Warburton ably argued, evidence of an early date and of a peculiar Divine effort to guard the Israelites against the contamination of Egyptian ideas upon the subject.

6. The omission of the hen from the lists of clean and unclean birds is incredible if these lists were made late in the nation's history after that domestic fowl had been introduced from India.

7. As Rev. A. C. Robinson showed in Volume VII of this series it is incredible that there should have been no intimation in the Pentateuch of the existence of Jerusalem, or of the use of music in the liturgy, nor any use of the phrase, "Lord of Hosts," unless the compilation had been completed before the time of David.

8. The subordination of the miraculous elements in the Pentateuch to the critical junctures in the nation's development is such as could be obtained only in genuine history.

9. The whole representation conforms to the true law of historical development. Nations do not rise by virtue of inherent resident forces, but through the struggles of great leaders enlightened directly from on high or by contact with others who have already been enlightened.

The defender of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch has no occasion to quail in presence of the critics who deny that authorship and discredit its history. He may boldly challenge their scholarship, deny their conclusions, resent their arrogance, and hold on to his confidence in the well authenticated historical evidence which sufficed for those who first accepted it. Those who now at second hand are popularizing in periodicals, Sunday School lessons, and volumes of greater or less pretentions the errors of these critics must answer to their consciences as best they can, but they should be made to feel that they assume a heavy responsibility in putting themselves forward as leaders of the blind when they themselves are not able to see.

CHAPTER III.

FALLACIES OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

BY FRANKLIN JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D.

The errors of the higher criticism of which I shall write pertain to its very substance. Those of a secondary character the limits of my space forbid me to consider. My discussion might be greatly expanded by additional masses of illustrative material, and hence I close it with a list of books which I recommend to persons who may wish to pursue the subject further.

DEFINITION OF "THE HIGHER CRITICISM."

As an introduction to the fundamental fallacies of the higher criticism, let me state what the higher criticism is, and then what the higher critics tell us they have achieved.

The name "the higher criticism" was coined by Eichhorn, who lived from 1752 to 1827. Zenos,* after careful consideration, adopts the definition of the name given by its author: "The discovery and verification of the facts regarding the origin, form and value of literary productions upon the basis of their internal characters." The higher critics are not blind to some other sources of argument. They refer to history where they can gain any polemic advantage by doing so. The background of the entire picture which they bring to us is the assumption that the hypothesis of evolution is true. But after all their chief appeal is to the supposed evidence of the documents themselves.

Other names for the movement have been sought. It has been called the "historic view," on the assumption that it represents the real history of the Hebrew people as it must have unfolded itself by the orderly processes of human evolution.

*"The Elements of the Higher Criticism."

But, as the higher critics contradict the testimony of all the Hebrew historic documents which profess to be early, their theory might better be called the "unhistoric view." The higher criticism has sometimes been called the "documentary hypothesis." But as all schools of criticism and all doctrines of inspiration are equally hospitable to the supposition that the biblical writers may have consulted documents, and may have quoted them, the higher criticism has no special right to this title. We must fall back, therefore, upon the name "the higher criticism" as the very best at our disposal, and upon the definition of it as chiefly an inspection of literary productions in order to ascertain their dates, their authors, and their value, as they themselves, interpreted in the light of the hypothesis of evolution, may yield the evidence.

"ASSURED RESULTS" OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

I turn now to ask what the higher critics profess to have found out by this method of study. The "assured results" on which they congratulate themselves are stated variously. In this country and England they commonly assume a form less radical than that given them in Germany, though sufficiently startling and destructive to arouse vigorous protest and a vigorous demand for the evidences, which, as we shall see, have not been produced and cannot be produced. The less startling form of the "assured results" usually announced in England and America may be owing to the brighter light of Christianity in these countries. Yet it should be noticed that there are higher critics in this country and England who go beyond the principal German representatives of the school in their zeal for the dethronement of the Old Testament and the New, in so far as these holy books are presented to the world as the very Word of God, as a special revelation from heaven.

The following statement from Zenos* may serve to introduce us to the more moderate form of the "assured results"

*Page 205.

reached by the higher critics. It is concerning the analysis of the Pentateuch, or rather of the Hexateuch, the Book of Joshua being included in the survey. "The Hexateuch is a composite work whose origin and history may be traced in four distinct stages: (1) A writer designated as J. Jahvist, or Jehovist, or Judean prophetic historian, composed a history of the people of Israel about 800 B. C. (2) A writer designated as E. Elohist, or Ephraemite prophetic historian, wrote a similar work some fifty years later, or about 750 B. C. These two were used separately for a time, but were fused together into JE by a redactor [an editor], at the end of the seventh century. (3) A writer of different character wrote a book constituting the main portion of our present Deuteronomy during the reign of Josiah, or a short time before 621 B. C. This writer is designated as D. To his work were added an introduction and an appendix, and with these accretions it was united with JE by a second redactor, constituting JED. (4) Contemporaneously with Ezekiel the ritual law began to be reduced to writing. It first appeared in three parallel forms. These were codified by Ezra not very much earlier than 444 B. C., and between that date and 280 B. C. it was joined with JED by a final redactor. Thus no less than nine or ten men were engaged in the production of the Hexateuch in its present form, and each one can be distinguished from the rest by his vocabulary and style and his religious point of view."

Such is the analysis of the Pentateuch as usually stated in this country. But in Germany and Holland its chief representatives carry the division of labor much further. Wellhausen distributes the total task among twenty-two writers, and Kuenen among eighteen. Many others resolve each individual writer into a school of writers, and thus multiply the numbers enormously. There is no agreement among the higher critics concerning this analysis, and therefore the cautious learner may well wait till those who represent the theory tell him just what it is they desire him to learn.

While some of the "assured results" are thus in doubt, certain things are matters of general agreement. Moses wrote little or nothing, if he ever existed. A large part of the Hexateuch consists of unhistorical legends. We may grant that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Ishmael and Esau existed, or we may deny this. In either case, what is recorded of them is chiefly myth. These denials of the truth of the written records follow as matters of course from the late dating of the books, and the assumption that the writers could set down only the national tradition. They may have worked in part as collectors of written stories to be found here and there; but, if so, these written stories were not ancient, and they were diluted by stories transmitted orally. These fragments, whether written or oral, must have followed the general law of national traditions, and have presented a mixture of legendary chaff, with here and there a grain of historic truth to be sifted out by careful winnowing.

Thus far of the Hexateuch.

The Psalms are so full of references to the Hexateuch that they must have been written after it, and hence after the captivity, perhaps beginning about 400 B. C. David may possibly have written one or two of them, but probably he wrote none, and the strong conviction of the Hebrew people that he was their greatest hymn-writer was a total mistake.

These revolutionary processes are carried into the New Testament, and that also is found to be largely untrustworthy as history, as doctrine, and as ethics, though a very good book, since it gives expression to high ideals, and thus ministers to the spiritual life. It may well have influence, but it can have no divine authority. The Christian reader should consider carefully this invasion of the New Testament by the higher criticism. So long as the movement was confined to the Old Testament many good men looked on with indifference, not reflecting that the Bible, though containing "many parts" by many writers, and though recording a progressive revelation,

is, after all, one book. But the limits of the Old Testament have long since been overpassed by the higher critics, and it is demanded of us that we abandon the immemorial teaching of the church concerning the entire volume. The picture of Christ which the New Testament sets before us is in many respects mistaken. The doctrines of primitive Christianity which it states and defends were well enough for the time, but have no value for us today except as they commend themselves to our independent judgment. Its moral precepts are fallible, and we should accept them or reject them freely, in accordance with the greater light of the twentieth century. Even Christ could err concerning ethical questions, and neither His commandments nor His example need constrain us.

The foregoing may serve as an introductory sketch, all too brief, of the higher criticism, and as a basis of the discussion of its fallacies, now immediately to follow.

FIRST FALLACY: THE ANALYSIS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

I. The first fallacy that I shall bring forward is its analysis of the Pentateuch.

1. We cannot fail to observe that these various documents and their various authors and editors are only imagined. As Green* has said, "There is no evidence of the existence of these documents and redactors, and no pretense of any, apart from the critical tests which have determined the analysis. All tradition and all historical testimony as to the origin of the Pentateuch are against them. The burden of proof is wholly upon the critics. And this proof should be clear and convincing in proportion to the gravity and the revolutionary character of the consequences which it is proposed to base upon it."

2. Moreover, we know what can be done, or rather what cannot be done, in the analysis of composite literary productions. Some of the plays of Shakespeare are called his "mixed plays," because it is known that he collaborated with another

*"Moses and His Recent Critics," pages 104, 105.

author in their production. The very keenest critics have sought to separate his part in these plays from the rest, but they confess that the result is uncertainty and dissatisfaction. Coleridge professed to distinguish the passages contributed by Shakespeare by a process of feeling, but Macaulay pronounced this claim to be nonsense, and the entire effort, whether made by the analysis of phraseology and style, or by esthetic perceptions, is an admitted failure. And this in spite of the fact that the style of Shakespeare is one of the most peculiar and inimitable. The Anglican Prayer Book is another composite production which the higher critics have often been invited to analyze and distribute to its various sources. Some of the authors of these sources lived centuries apart. They are now well known from the studies of historians. But the Prayer Book itself does not reveal one of them, though its various vocabularies and styles have been carefully interrogated. Now if the analysis of the Pentateuch can lead to such certainties, why should not the analysis of Shakespeare and the Prayer Book do as much? How can men accomplish in a foreign language what they cannot accomplish in their own? How can they accomplish in a dead language what they cannot accomplish in a living language? How can they distinguish ten or eighteen or twenty-two collaborators in a small literary production, when they cannot distinguish two? These questions have been asked many times, but the higher critics have given no answer whatever, preferring the safety of a learned silence;

"The oracles are dumb."

3. Much has been made of differences of vocabulary in the Pentateuch, and elaborate lists of words have been assigned to each of the supposed authors. But these distinctions fade away when subjected to careful scrutiny, and Driver admits that "the phraseological criteria * * * are slight." Orr,* who quotes this testimony, adds, "They are slight, in fact, to a degree of tenuity that often makes the recital of them appear like trifling."

*"The Problem of the Old Testament," page 230.

SECOND FALLACY: THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION APPLIED TO LITERATURE AND RELIGION.

II. A second fundamental fallacy of the higher criticism is its dependence on the theory of evolution as the explanation of the history of literature and of religion. The progress of the higher criticism towards its present state has been rapid and assured since Vatke[1] discovered in the Hegelian philosophy of evolution a means of biblical criticism. The Spencerian philosophy of evolution, aided and reinforced by Darwinism, has added greatly to the confidence of the higher critics. As Vatke, one of the earlier members of the school, made the hypothesis of evolution the guiding presupposition of his critical work, so today does Professor Jordan,[2] the very latest representative of the higher criticism. "The nineteenth century," he declares, "has applied to the history of the documents of the Hebrew people its own magic word, evolution. The thought represented by that popular word has been found to have a real meaning in our investigations regarding the religious life and the theological beliefs of Israel." Thus, were there no hypothesis of evolution, there would be no higher criticism. The "assured results" of the higher criticism have been gained, after all, not by an inductive study of the biblical books to ascertain if they present a great variety of styles and vocabularies and religious points of view. They have been attained by assuming that the hypothesis of evolution is true, and that the religion of Israel must have unfolded itself by a process of natural evolution. They have been attained by an interested cross-examination of the biblical books to constrain them to admit the hypothesis of evolution. The imagination has played a large part in the process, and the so-called evidences upon which the "assured results" rest are largely imaginary.

But the hypothesis of evolution, when applied to the his-

[1] "Die Biblische Theologie Wissenschaftlich Dargestellt."

[2] "Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought," T. and T. Clark, 1909.

tory of literature, is a fallacy, leaving us utterly unable to account for Homer, or Dante, or Shakespeare, the greatest poets of the world, yet all of them writing in the dawn of the great literatures of the world. It is a fallacy when applied to the history of religion, leaving us utterly unable to account for Abraham and Moses and Christ, and requiring us to deny that they could have been such men as the Bible declares them to have been. The hypothesis is a fallacy when applied to the history of the human race in general. Our race has made progress under the influence of supernatural revelation; but progress under the influence of supernatural revelation is one thing, and evolution is another. Buckle* undertook to account for history by a thorough-going application of the hypothesis of evolution to its problems; but no historian today believes that he succeeded in his effort, and his work is universally regarded as a brilliant curiosity. The types of evolution advocated by different higher critics are widely different from one another, varying from the pure naturalism of Wellhausen to the recognition of some feeble rays of supernatural revelation; but the hypothesis of evolution in any form, when applied to human history, blinds us and renders us incapable of beholding the glory of God in its more signal manifestations.

THIRD FALLACY: THE BIBLE A NATURAL BOOK.

III. A third fallacy of the higher critics is the doctrine concerning the Scriptures which they teach. If a consistent hypothesis of evolution is made the basis of our religious thinking, the Bible will be regarded as only a product of human nature working in the field of religious literature. It will be merely a natural book. If there are higher critics who recoil from this application of the hypothesis of evolution and who seek to modify it by recognizing some special evidences of the divine in the Bible, the inspiration of which they speak rises but little higher than the providential guidance of the writers.

*"History of Civilization in England."

The church doctrine of the full inspiration of the Bible is almost never held by the higher critics of any class, even of the more believing. Here and there we may discover one and another who try to save some fragments of the church doctrine, but they are few and far between, and the salvage to which they cling is so small and poor that it is scarcely worth while. Throughout their ranks the storm of opposition to the supernatural in all its forms is so fierce as to leave little place for the faith of the church that the Bible is the very Word of God to man. But the fallacy of this denial is evident to every believer who reads the Bible with an open mind. He knows by an immediate consciousness that it is the product of the Holy Spirit. As the sheep know the voice of the shepherd, so the mature Christian knows that the Bible speaks with a divine voice. On this ground every Christian can test the value of the higher criticism for himself. The Bible manifests itself to the spiritual perception of the Christian as in the fullest sense human, and in the fullest sense divine. This is true of the Old Testament, as well as of the New.

FOURTH FALLACY: THE MIRACLES DENIED.

IV. Yet another fallacy of the higher critics is found in their teachings concerning the biblical miracles. If the hypothesis of evolution is applied to the Scriptures consistently, it will lead us to deny all the miracles which they record. But if applied timidly and waveringly, as it is by some of the English and American higher critics, it will lead us to deny a large part of the miracles, and to inject as much of the natural as is any way possible into the rest. We shall strain out as much of the gnat of the supernatural as we can, and swallow as much of the camel of evolution as we can. We shall probably reject all the miracles of the Old Testament, explaining some of them as popular legends, and others as coincidences. In the New Testament we shall pick and choose, and no two of us will agree concerning those to be rejected

and those to be accepted. If the higher criticism shall be adopted as the doctrine of the church, believers will be left in a distressing state of doubt and uncertainty concerning the narratives of the four Gospels, and unbelievers will scoff and mock. A theory which leads to such wanderings of thought regarding the supernatural in the Scriptures must be fallacious. God is not a God of confusion.

Among the higher critics who accept some of the miracles there is a notable desire to discredit the virgin birth of our Lord, and their treatment of this event presents a good example of the fallacies of reasoning by means of which they would abolish many of the other miracles. One feature of their argument may suffice as an exhibition of all. It is the search for parallels in the pagan mythologies. There are many instances in the pagan stories of the birth of men from human mothers and divine fathers, and the higher critics would create the impression that the writers who record the birth of Christ were influenced by these fables to emulate them, and thus to secure for Him the honor of a celestial paternity. It turns out, however, that these pagan fables do not in any case present to us a virgin mother; the child is always the product of commerce with a god who assumes a human form for the purpose. The despair of the higher critics in this hunt for events of the same kind is well illustrated by Cheyne,* who cites the record of the Babylonian king Sargon, about 3,800 B. C. This monarch represents himself as having "been born of a poor mother in secret, and as not knowing his father." There have been many millions of such instances, but we do not think of the mothers as virgins. Nor does the Babylonian story affirm that the mother of Sargon was a virgin, or even that his father was a god. It is plain that Sargon did not intend to claim a supernatural origin, for, after saying that he "did not know his father," he adds that "the brother of his father lived in the mountains." It was a case

*"Bible Problems," page 86.

like multitudes of others in which children, early orphaned, have not known their fathers, but have known the relations of their fathers. This statement of Sargon I quote from a translation of it made by Cheyne himself in the "Encyclopedia Biblica." He continues, "There is reason to suspect that something similar was originally said by the Israelites of Moses." To substantiate this he adds, "See Encyclopedia Biblica, 'Moses,' section 3 with note 4." On turning to this reference the reader finds that the article was written by Cheyne himself, and that it contains no evidence whatever.

FIFTH FALLACY: THE TESTIMONY OF ARCHAEOLOGY DENIED.

V. The limitation of the field of research as far as possible to the biblical books as literary productions has rendered many of the higher critics reluctant to admit the new light derived from archaeology. This is granted by Cheyne.* "I have no wish to deny," he says, "that the so-called 'higher critics' in the past were as a rule suspicious of Assyriology as a young, and, as they thought, too self-assertive science, and that many of those who now recognize its contributions to knowledge are somewhat too mechanical in the use of it, and too skeptical as to the influence of Babylonian culture in relatively early times in Syria, Palestine and even Arabia." This grudging recognition of the testimony of archaeology may be observed in several details.

1. It was said that the Hexateuch must have been formed chiefly by the gathering up of oral traditions, because it is not to be supposed that the early Hebrews possessed the art of writing and of keeping records. But the entire progress of archaeological study refutes this. In particular the discovery of the Tel el-Amarna tablets has shown that writing in cuneiform characters and in the Assyrio-Babylonian language was common to the entire biblical world long before the exodus.

*"Bible Problems," page 142.

The discovery was made by Egyptian peasants in 1887. There are more than three hundred tablets, which came from various lands, including Babylonia and Palestine. Other finds have added their testimony to the fact that writing and the preservation of records were the peculiar passions of the ancient civilized world. Under the constraint of the overwhelming evidences, Professor Jordan writes as follows: "The question as to the age of writing never played a great part in the discussion." He falls back on the supposition that the nomadic life of the early Hebrews would prevent them from acquiring the art of writing. He treats us to such reasoning as the following: "If the fact that writing is very old is such a powerful argument when taken alone, it might enable you to prove that Alfred the Great wrote Shakespeare's plays."

2. It was easy to treat Abraham as a mythical figure when the early records of Babylonia were but little known. The entire coloring of those chapters of Genesis which refer to Mesopotamia could be regarded as the product of the imagination. This is no longer the case. Thus Clay,* writing of Genesis 14, says: "The theory of the late origin of all the Hebrew Scriptures prompted the critics to declare this narrative to be a pure invention of a later Hebrew writer. * * * The patriarchs were relegated to the region of myth and legend. Abraham was made a fictitious father of the Hebrews. * * * Even the political situation was declared to be inconsistent with fact. * * * Weighing carefully the position taken by the critics in the light of what has been revealed through the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions, we find that the very foundations upon which their theories rest, with reference to the points that could be tested, totally disappear. The truth is, that wherever any light has been thrown upon the subject through excavations, their hypotheses have invariably been found wanting." But the higher critics are

*"Light on the Old Testament from Babel." 1907. Clay is Assistant Professor and Assistant Curator of the Babylonian Section, Department of Archaeology, in the University of Pennsylvania.

still reluctant to admit this new light. Thus Kent[1] says, "The primary value of these stories is didactic and religious, rather than historical."

3. The books of Joshua and Judges have been regarded by the higher critics as unhistorical on the ground that their portraiture of the political, religious, and social condition of Palestine in the thirteenth century B. C. is incredible. This cannot be said any longer, for the recent excavations in Palestine have shown us a land exactly like that of these books. The portraiture is so precise, and is drawn out in so many minute lineaments, that it cannot be the product of oral tradition floating down through a thousand years. In what details the accuracy of the biblical picture of early Palestine is exhibited may be seen perhaps best in the excavations by Macalister[2] at Gezer. Here again there are absolutely no discrepancies between the Land and the Book, for the Land lifts up a thousand voices to testify that the Book is history and not legend.

4. It was held by the higher critics that the legislation which we call Mosaic could not have been produced by Moses, since his age was too early for such codes. This reasoning was completely negatived by the discovery of the code of Hammurabi, the Amraphel[3] of Genesis 14. This code is very different from that of Moses; it is more systematic; and it is at least seven hundred years earlier than the Mosaic legislation.

In short, from the origin of the higher criticism till this present time the discoveries in the field of archaeology have given it a succession of serious blows. The higher critics were shocked when the passion of the ancient world for writing and the preservation of documents was discovered. They were shocked when primitive Babylonia appeared as the land of Abraham. They were shocked when early Palestine appeared as the land of Joshua and the Judges. They were shocked when

[1] Biblical World, Dec., 1906.
[2] "Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer."
[3] On this matter see any dictionary of the Bible, art. "Amraphel."

Amraphel came back from the grave as a real historical character, bearing his code of laws. They were shocked when the stele of the Pharaoh of the exodus was read, and it was proved that he knew a people called Israel, that they had no settled place of abode, that they were "without grain" for food, and that in these particulars they were quite as they are represented by the Scriptures to have been when they had fled from Egypt into the wilderness.* The embarrassment created by these discoveries is manifest in many of the recent writings of the higher critics, in which, however, they still cling heroically to their analysis and their late dating of the Pentateuch and their confidence in the hypothesis of evolution as the key of all history.

SIXTH FALLACY: THE PSALMS WRITTEN AFTER THE EXILE.

VI. The Psalms are usually dated by the higher critics after the exile. The great majority of the higher critics are agreed here, and tell us that these varied and touching and magnificent lyrics of religious experience all come to us from a period later than 450 B. C. A few of the critics admit an earlier origin of three or four of them, but they do this waveringly, grudgingly, and against the general consensus of opinion among their fellows. In the Bible a very large number of the Psalms are ascribed to David, and these, with a few insignificant and doubtful exceptions, are denied to him and brought down, like the rest, to the age of the second temple. This leads me to the following observations:

*The higher critics usually slur over this remarkable inscription, and give us neither an accurate translation nor a natural interpretation of it. I have, therefore, special pleasure in quoting the following from Driver, "Authority and Archaeology," page 61: "Whereas the other places named in the inscription all have the determinative for 'country,' Ysiraal has the determinative for 'men': it follows that the reference is not to the land of Israel, but to Israel as a tribe or people, whether migratory, or on the march." Thus this distinguished higher critic sanctions the view of the record which I have adopted. He represents Maspero and Naville as doing the same.

1. Who wrote the Psalms? Here the higher critics have no answer. Of the period from 400 to 175 B. C. we are in almost total ignorance. Josephus knows almost nothing about it, nor has any other writer told us more. Yet, according to the theory, it was precisely in these centuries of silence, when the Jews had no great writers, that they produced this magnificent outburst of sacred song.

2. This is the more remarkable when we consider the well known men to whom the theory denies the authorship of any of the Psalms. The list includes such names as Moses, David, Samuel, Nathan, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the long list of preëxilic prophets. We are asked to believe that these men composed no Psalms, and that the entire collection was contributed by men so obscure that they have left no single name by which we can identify them with their work.

3. This will appear still more extraordinary if we consider the times in which, it is said, no Psalms were produced, and contrast them with the times in which all of them were produced. The times in which none were produced were the great times, the times of growth, of mental ferment, of conquest, of imperial expansion, of disaster, and of recovery. The times in which none were produced were the times of the splendid temple of Solomon, with its splendid worship. The times in which none were produced were the heroic times of Elijah and Elisha, when the people of Jehovah struggled for their existence against the abominations of the pagan gods. On the other hand, the times which actually produced them were the times of growing legalism, of obscurity, and of inferior abilities. All this is incredible. We could believe it only if we first came to believe that the Psalms are works of slight literary and religious value. This is actually done by Wellhausen, who says,* "They certainly are to the smallest extent original, and are for the most part imitations which illustrate the saying about much writing." The Psalms are not all of an

*Quoted by Orr, "The Problem of the Old Testament," page 435.

equally high degree of excellence, and there are a few of them which might give some faint color of justice to this depreciation of the entire collection. But as a whole they are exactly the reverse of this picture. Furthermore, they contain absolutely no legalism, but are as free from it as are the Sermon on the Mount and the Pauline epistles. Yet further, the writers stand out as personalities, and they must have left a deep impression upon their fellows. Finally, they were full of the fire of genius kindled by the Holy Spirit. It is impossible for us to attribute the Psalms to the unknown mediocrities of the period which followed the restoration.

4. Very many of the Psalms plainly appear to be ancient. They sing of early events, and have no trace of allusion to the age which is said to have produced them.

5. The large number of Psalms attributed to David have attracted the special attention of the higher critics. They are denied to him on various grounds. He was a wicked man, and hence incapable of writing these praises to the God of righteousness. He was an iron warrior and statesman, and hence not gifted with the emotions found in these productions. He was so busy with the cares of conquest and administration that he had no leisure for literary work. Finally, his conception of God was utterly different from that which moved the psalmists.

The larger part of this catalogue of inabilities is manifestly erroneous. David, with some glaring faults, and with a single enormous crime, for which he was profoundly penitent, was one of the noblest of men. He was indeed an iron warrior and statesman, but also one of the most emotional of all great historic characters. He was busy, but busy men not seldom find relief in literary occupations, as Washington, during the Revolutionary War, poured forth a continual tide of letters, and as Cæsar, Marcus Aurelius, and Gladstone, while burdened with the cares of empire, composed immortal books. The conception of God with which David began his career was indeed narrow (I. Sam. 26:19). But did he learn nothing

in all his later experiences, and his associations with holy priests and prophets? He was certainly teachable: did God fail to make use of him in further revealing Himself to His people? To deny these Psalms to David on the ground of his limited views of God in his early life, is this not to deny that God made successive revelations of Himself wherever He found suitable channels? If, further, we consider the unquestioned skill of David in the music of his nation and his age (I. Sam. 16:14-25), this will constitute a presupposition in favor of his interest in sacred song. If, finally, we consider his personal career of danger and deliverance, this will appear as the natural means of awakening in him the spirit of varied religious poetry. His times were much like the Elizabethan period, which ministered unexampled stimulus to the English mind.

From all this we may turn to the singular verdict of Professor Jordan: "If a man says he cannot see why David could not have written Psalms 51 and 139, you are compelled to reply as politely as possible that if he did write them then any man can write anything." So also we may say, "as politely as possible," that if Shakespeare, with his "small Latin and less Greek," did write his incomparable dramas, "then any man can write anything"; that if Dickens, with his mere elementary education, did write his great novels, "then any man can write anything"; and that if Lincoln, who had no early schooling, did write his Gettysburg address, "then any man can write anything."

SEVENTH FALLACY: DEUTERONOMY NOT WRITTEN BY MOSES.

VII. One of the fixed points of the higher criticism is its theory of the origin of Deuteronomy. In I. Kings 22 we have the history of the finding of the book of the law in the temple, which was being repaired. Now the higher critics present this finding, not as the discovery of an ancient docu-

ment, but as the finding of an entirely new document, which had been concealed in the temple in order that it might be found, might be accepted as the production of Moses, and might produce an effect by its assumed authorship. It is not supposed for a moment that the writer innocently chose the fictitious dress of Mosaic authorship for merely literary purposes. On the contrary, it is steadfastly maintained that he intended to deceive, and that others were with him in the plot to deceive. This statement of the case leads me to the following reflections:

1. According to the theory, this was an instance of pious fraud. And the fraud must have been prepared deliberately. The manuscript must have been soiled and frayed by special care, for it was at once admitted to be ancient. This supposition of deceit must always repel the Christian believer.

2. Our Lord draws from the Book of Deuteronomy all the three texts with which He foils the tempter, Matt. 4:1-11, Luke 4:1-14. It must always shock the devout student that his Saviour should select His weapons from an armory founded on deceit.

3. This may be called an appeal to ignorant piety, rather than to scholarly criticism. But surely the moral argument should have some weight in scholarly criticism. In the sphere of religion moral impossibilities are as insuperable as physical and mental.

4. If we turn to consideration of a literary kind, it is to be observed that the higher criticism runs counter here to the statement of the book itself that Moses was its author.

5. It runs counter to the narrative of the finding of the book, and turns the finding of an ancient book into the forgery of a new book.

6. It runs counter to the judgment of all the intelligent men of the time who learned of the discovery. They judged the book to have come down from the Mosaic age, and to be from the pen of Moses. We hear of no dissent whatever.

7. It seeks support in a variety of reasons, such as style, historical discrepancies, and legal contradictions, all of which prove of little substance when examined fairly.

EIGHTH FALLACY: THE PRIESTLY LEGISLATION NOT ENACTED UNTIL THE EXILE.

VIII. Another case of forgery is found in the origin of the priestly legislation, if we are to believe the higher critics. This legislation is contained in a large number of passages scattered through Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. It has to do chiefly with the tabernacle and its worship, with the duties of the priests and Levites, and with the relations of the people to the institutions of religion. It is attributed to Moses in scores of places. It has a strong coloring of the Mosaic age and of the wilderness life. It affirms the existence of the tabernacle, with an orderly administration of the ritual services. But this is all imagined, for the legislation is a late production. Before the exile there were temple services and a priesthood, with certain regulations concerning them, either oral or written, and use was made of this tradition; but as a whole the legislation was enacted by such men as Ezekiel and Ezra during and immediately after the exile, or about 444 B. C. The name of Moses, the fiction of a tabernacle, and the general coloring of the Mosaic age, were given it in order to render it authoritative and to secure the ready obedience of the nation. But now:

1. The moral objection here is insuperable. The supposition of forgery, and of forgery so cunning, so elaborate, and so minute, is abhorrent. If the forgery had been invented and executed by wicked men to promote some scheme of selfishness, it would have been less odious. But when it is presented to us as the expedient of holy men, for the advancement of the religion of the God of righteousness, which afterwards blossomed out into Christianity, we must revolt.

2. The theory gives us a portraiture of such men as

Ezekiel and Ezra which is utterly alien from all that we know of them. The expedient might be worthy of the prophets of Baal or of Chemosh; it was certainly not worthy of the prophets of Jehovah, and we dishonor them when we attribute it to them and place them upon a low plane of craft and cunning of which the records concerning them are utterly ignorant.

3. The people who returned from the exile were among the most intelligent and enterprising of the nation, else they would not have returned, and they would not have been deceived by the sudden appearance of Mosaic laws forged for the occasion and never before heard of.

4. Many of the regulations of this legislation are drastic. It subjected the priests and Levites to a rule which must have been irksome in the extreme, and it would not have been lightly accepted. We may be certain that if it had been a new thing fraudulently ascribed to Moses, these men would have detected the deceit, and would have refused to be bound by it. But we do not hear of any revolt, or even of any criticism.

Such are some of the fundamental fallacies of the higher criticism. They constitute an array of impossibilities. I have stated them in their more moderate forms, that they may be seen and weighed without the remarkable extravagances which some of their advocates indulge. In the very mildest interpretation which can be given them, they are repugnant to the Christian faith.

NO MIDDLE GROUND.

But might we not accept a part of this system of thought without going to any hurtful extreme? Many today are seeking to do this. They present to us two diverse results.

1. Some, who stand at the beginning of the tide, find themselves in a position of doubt. If they are laymen, they know not what to believe. If they are ministers, they know not what to believe or to teach. In either case, they have no firm footing, and no Gospel, except a few platitudes which do little harm and little good.

2. The majority of those who struggle to stand here find it impossible to do so, and give themselves up to the current. There is intellectual consistency in the lofty church doctrine of inspiration. There may be intellectual consistency in the doctrine that all things have had a natural origin and history, under the general providence of God, as distinguished from His supernatural revelation of Himself through holy men, and especially through His co-equal Son, so that the Bible is as little supernatural as the "Imitation of Christ" or the "Pilgrim's Progress." But there is no position of intellectual consistency between these two, and the great mass of those who try to pause at various points along the descent are swept down with the current. The natural view of the Scriptures is a sea which has been rising higher for three-quarters of a century. Many Christians bid it welcome to pour lightly over the walls which the faith of the church has always set up against it, in the expectation that it will prove a healthful and helpful stream. It is already a cataract, uprooting, destroying, and slaying.

CHAPTER IV

THE BIBLE AND MODERN CRITICISM

BY F. BETTEX, D. D.,
PROFESSOR EMERITUS, STUTTGART, GERMANY

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL GERMAN
BY DAVID HEAGLE, D. D.

It is undeniable that the universe, including ourselves, exists. Whence comes it all? For any clear-thinking mind there are only three possibilities. Either the universe has existed always, it produced itself, or it was created by a Divine, a Supreme Being.

THE UNIVERSE NOT ETERNAL

The eternity of the universe is most clearly disproved by its evolution. From a scientific point of view that hypothesis is now discredited and virtually abandoned. Astronomers, physicists, biologists, philosophers, are beginning to recognize more and more, and men like Secchi, Dubois-Reymond, Lord Kelvin, Dr. Klein and others, unanimously affirm that creation has had a beginning. It always tends towards an entropy, that is, toward a perfect equilibrium of its forces, a complete standstill; and the fact that it has not yet reached such a condition is proof that it has not always existed. Should creation, however, ever come to a standstill, it could never again put itself in motion. It has had a beginning, and it will have an end. That is demonstrated most clearly by its still unfinished evolution. Should anyone say to us, of a growing tree or of a young child, that either of these forms of life has existed forever, we would at once reply, Why has it not then long ago, in the past eternity, grown up so as to reach

the heaven of heavens? In like manner, reasons that great astronomer, William Herschel, with regard to the Milky-Way, that just as its breaking up into different parts shows that it cannot always endure, so we have. in this same fact, proof that it has not eternally existed.

GOD THE AUTHOR OF ALL THINGS

There remains, therefore, only this alternative: either the world produced itself, or it was created. That all things came into existence spontaneously, and therefore that we must suppose an origination of immeasurably great effects without any cause, or believe that at some time a nothing, without either willing or knowing it, and without the use of means, became a something—this is the most unreasonable assumption that could possibly be attributed to a human being. How could anything act before it existed? or a thing not yet created produce something? There is nothing more unreasonable than the creed of the unbeliever, notwithstanding all his prating about the excellence of reason.

But if this world did not produce itself, then it must have been created by some Higher Power, some Cause of all causes, such as was that First Principle upon which the dying Cicero called. Or, to use the words of Dr. Klein, that originating cause must have been a "Supreme Intelligence that has at its command unlimited creative power" *(Kosmologische Briefe,* p. 27). Hence what that Intelligence does is both illimitable and unfathomable, and it can at any time either change this world or make a new one. It is therefore *prima facie* silly for us, with our prodigiously narrow experience, to set any kind of bounds to the Supreme Being; and a God who works no miracles and is the slave of his own laws implanted in nature, such a God as the New Theology preaches, is as much lacking in being a true Divinity as is the unconscious, but all-wise "cosmic ether" of Spiller, or the "eternal stuff" of other materialists.

We conclude, then, that the universe was created, or that God is the author of all things.

REVELATION IN NATURE

But now the question arises whether God, who is both the Creator of all things and the Father of spirits, has revealed Himself to his creatures, or to His own children, the work of His hands. Such a question might surely provoke one's laughter. For what is the entire universe? what is this created nature of which we form a part? what is air? and water? and fire? what are all organized beings, my body with its many parts put together in such a highly artistic and inscrutable fashion; my soul with its infinite capabilities so little understood by myself? What are all these matters but a progressive revelation of God, given to us, as it were, in a series of concentric circles rising one above another toward their Source? For this purpose it was that God created the visible, so that through it we might perceive the invisible, and for this purpose the whole creation was made, so that through it might be manifested the invisible things of God, even his eternal power and godhead (Rom. 1:20). Creation is only the language of "the Word that was in the beginning, and was with God, and was God, and by Whom all things were made" (John 1:1-3). What does this Word declare? What else but the great infinite name of God the Father, the primal source of all things, the name that must be hallowed? There was a time, however, even before the world was, when there existed nothing but God and his name. All the different works of creation are only letters in this great name.

REVELATION IN THE BIBLE

But there is another revelation which God has given of Himself to men—a more definite and personal one. Thus, e. g., he declared Himself to Adam, and through Enoch and Noah to the antediluvians, and again after the flood to other

generations through Noah and his sons. But because at the building of the tower of Babel men turned stubbornly away from God, He gave them up to the thoughts of their own heart, and selected one man, Abraham, to go out from his friends and kindred, so that in his seed all the nations of the world might be blessed. Then, first, out of Abraham came the people of Israel, to whom were committed the oracles of God; and from this period began the history of the written Word. Moses narrates the beginning of things, also records the law, and holy men of God speak and write as they are moved by the Holy Spirit. That is inspiration—a divine *in-breathing.*

But here a distinction must be made. The Bible reports matters of history, and in doing so includes many genealogies which were composed, first of all, not for us, but for those most immediately concerned, and for the angels (1 Cor. 4:9). Also it reports many sins and shameful deeds; for just as the sun first illuminates himself and then sheds his radiance upon the ocean and the puddle, the eagle and the worm, so the Bible undertakes to represent to us not only God, but also man just as he is. In giving us these narratives it may be said, moreover, that God, who numbers the very hairs of our head, exercised a providential control, so that what was reported by His chosen men should be the real facts, and nothing else. To what extent He inspired those men with the very words used by them, it is not for us to know, but probably more fully than we suspect.

But when God, after having communicated the law to Moses on Mount Sinai and in the Tabernacle, communes with him as a friend with friend, and Moses writes "all the words of this law in a book" (Deut. 28:58; 31:24), then Moses really becomes the pen of God. When God speaks to the prophets, "Behold, I put my words in thy mouth," and "all the words that thou hearest thou shalt say to this people," then these prophets become the very mouth of God. When Christ

appears to John on Patmos, and says, "To the angel of the church write these things," this is an instance of verbal dictation.

But just here we are amused at those weak-minded critics who, with hackneyed phrases, talk so glibly about "mechanical instruments" and "mere verbal dictation." Does then a self-revelation of the Almighty and a making known of His counsels, a gracious act which exalts the human agent to be a co-worker with Jehovah, annihilate personal freedom? Or does it not rather enlarge that freedom, and lift it up to a higher and more joyous activity? Am I then a "mechanical instrument" when with deep devotion and with enthusiasm I repeat after Christ, word for word, the prayer which He taught his disciples? The Bible is, consequently, a book which originated according to the will and with the co-operation of God; and as such it is our guide to eternity, conducting man, seemingly without a plan and yet with absolute certainty, all the way from the first creation and from Paradise on to the second or higher creation and to the New Jerusalem (Comp. Gen. 2:8-10 with Rev. 21:1, 2).

PROOF OF THE BIBLE'S INSPIRATION

How does the Bible prove itself to be a divinely inspired, heaven-given book, a communication from a Father to His children, and thus a revelation?

First, by the fact that, as does no other sacred book in the world, it condemns man and all his works. It does not praise either his wisdom, his reason, his art, or any progress that he has made; but it represents him as being in the sight of God, a miserable sinner, incapable of doing anything good, and deserving only death and endless perdition. Truly, a book which is able thus to speak, and in consequence causes millions of men, troubled in conscience, to prostrate themselves in the dust, crying, "God be merciful to me a sinner," must contain more than mere ordinary truth.

Secondly, the Bible exalts itself far above all merely human books by its announcement of the great incomprehensible mystery that, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son; that whosover believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). Where is there a god among all the heathen nations, be he Osiris, Brahma, Baal, Jupiter or Odin, that would have promised those people that, by taking upon himself the sin of the world and suffering its punishment, he would thus become a savior and redeemer to them?

Thirdly, the Bible sets the seal of its divine origin upon itself by means of the prophecies. Very appropriately does God inquire, through the prophet Isaiah, "Who, as I, shall call, and shall declare it, and set it in order for Me since I established the ancient people? and the things that are coming and shall come to pass, let them declare" (Ch. 44:7). Or says again, "I am God, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times, things not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all My pleasure; calling a ravenous bird from the east, and the man of My counsel from a far country. Yea, I have spoken, I will also bring it to pass; I have purposed, I will also do it" (Ch. 46:10, 11). Or, addressing Pharaoh, "Where are thy wise men, and let them tell thee, and let them know what the Lord of Hosts hath purposed upon Egypt" (Ch. 19:12). Again we say, where is there a god, or gods, a founder of religion, such as Confucius, Buddha, or Mohammed, who could, with such certainty, have predicted the future of even his own people? Or where is there a statesman who in these times can foretell what will be the condition of things in Europe one hundred or even ten years from now? Nevertheless the prophecies of Moses and his threatened judgments upon the Israelites have been literally fulfilled. Literally also have been fulfilled, (although who at the time would have believed it?) the prophecies respecting the destruction of those great ancient cities,

Babylon, Nineveh and Memphis. Who in these times would believe a like prophecy respecting London, Paris, or New York? Moreover, in a literal way has been fulfilled what the prophets David and Isaiah foresaw concerning the last sufferings of Christ—His death on the cross, His drinking of vinegar, and the casting of lots for His garments. And there are other prophecies which will still be most literally fulfilled, such as the promises made to Israel, the final judgment, and the end of the world. "For," as Habakkuk says, "the vision is yet for an appointed time, and will not lie. Though it tarry, wait for it; it will surely come" (Ch. 2:3).

Furthermore, the Bible has demonstrated its peculiar power by its influence with the martyrs. Think of the hundreds of thousands who, at different times and among different peoples, have sacrificed their all, their wives, their children, all their possessions, and finally life itself, on account of this book. Think of how they have, on the rack and at the stake, confessed the truth of the Bible, and borne testimony to its power. However, O ye critics and despisers of God's Word, if you will only write such a book and then die for it, we will believe you.

Lastly, the Bible shows itself every day to be a divinely given book by its beneficent influence among all kinds of people. It converts to a better life the ignorant and the learned, the beggar on the street and the king upon his throne, yonder poor woman dwelling in an attic, the greatest poet and the profoundest thinker, civilized Europeans and uncultured savages. Despite all the scoffing and derision of its enemies, it has been translated into hundreds of languages, and has been preached by thousands of missionaries to millions of people. It makes the proud humble and the dissolute virtuous; it consoles the unfortunate, and teaches man how to live patiently and die triumphantly. No other book or collection of books accomplishes for man the exceeding great benefits accomplished by this book of truth.

MODERN CRITICISM AND ITS RATIONALISTIC METHOD

In these times there has appeared a criticism which, constantly growing bolder in its attacks upon this sacred book, now decrees, with all self-assurance and confidence, that it is simply a human production. Besides other faults found with it, it is declared to be full of errors, many of its books to be spurious, written by unknown men at later dates than those assigned, etc., etc. But we ask, upon what fundamental principle, what axiom, is this verdict of the critics based? It is upon the idea that, as Renan expressed it, reason is capable of judging all things, but is itself judged by nothing. That is surely a proud dictum, but an empty one if its character is really noticed. To be sure, God has given reason to man, so that, in his customary way of planting and building, buying and selling, he may make a practical use of created nature by which he is surrounded. But is reason, even as respects matters of this life, in accord with itself? By no means. For, if that were so, whence comes all the strife and contention of men at home and abroad, in their places of business and their public assemblies, in art and science, in legislation, religion and philosophy? Does it not all proceed from the conflicts of reason? The entire history of our race is the history of millions of men gifted with reason who have been in perpetual conflict one with another. Is it with such reason, then, that sentence is to be pronounced upon a divinely given book? A purely rational revelation would certainly be a contradiction of terms; besides, it would be wholly superfluous. But when reason undertakes to speak of things entirely supernatural, invisible and eternal, it talks as a blind man does about colors, discoursing of matters concerning which it neither knows nor can know anything; and thus it makes itself ridiculous. It has not ascended up to heaven, neither has it descended into the deep; and therefore a purely rational religion is no religion at all.

INCOMPETENCY OF REASON FOR SPIRITUAL TRUTH

Reason alone has never inspired men with great sublime conceptions of spiritual truth, whether in the way of discovery or invention; but usually it has at first rejected and ridiculed such matters. And just so it is with these rationalistic critics, they have no appreciation or understanding of the high and sublime in God's Word. They understand neither the majesty of Isaiah, the pathos of David's repentance, the audacity of Moses' prayers, the philosophic depth of Ecclesiastes, nor the wisdom of Solomon which "uttereth her voice in the streets." According to them ambitious priests, at a later date than is commonly assigned, compiled all those books to which we have alluded; also they wrote the Sinaitic law, and invented the whole story of Moses' life. ("A magnificent fiction"—so one of the critics calls that story.) But if all this is so, then we must believe that cunning falsifiers, who were, however, so the critics say, devout men, genuine products of their day (although it calls for notice that the age in which those *devout men* lived, should, as was done to Christ, have persecuted and killed them, when usually an age loves its own children); that is to say, we must believe not only that shallow-minded men have uncovered for us eternal truths and the most distant future, but also that vulgar, interested liars, have declared to us the inexorable righteousness of a holy God! Of course, all that is nonsense; no one can believe it.

But if these critics discourse, as sometimes they do, with great self-assurance upon topics such as the history of Israel, the peculiar work of the prophets, revelation, inspiration, the essence of Christianity, the difference between the teachings of Christ and those of Paul, anyone who intelligently reads what they say is impressed with the idea that, although they display much ingenuity in their efforts, after all they do not really understand the matters concerning which they

speak. In like manner they talk with much ingenuity and show of learning about men with whom they have only a far-off acquaintance; and they discuss events in the realm of the Spirit where they have had no personal experience. Thus they both illustrate and prove the truth of the Scripture teaching that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." These critics say that God, not being a man, cannot speak; consequently there is no word of God! Also, God cannot manifest Himself in visible form; therefore all the accounts of such epiphanies are mythical tales! Inspiration, they tell us, is unthinkable; hence all representations of such acts are diseased imagination! Of prophecy there is none; what purports to be such was written after the events! Miracles are impossible; therefore all the reports of them, as given in the Bible, are mere fictions! Men always seek, thus it is explained, their own advantage and personal glory, and just so it was with those "prophets of Israel."

Such is what they call "impartial science," "unprejudiced research," "objective demonstration."

NOTHING NEW IN THESE "NEW" VIEWS

Moreover, these critics claim for their peculiar views that they are "new theology," and the "latest investigation." But that also is untrue. Even in the times of Christ the famous rabbi Hillel and his disciple Gamaliel substituted for the Mosaic law all manner of "traditions" (Matt. 15:2-9; 23:16-22). Since then other learned rabbis, such as Ben Akiba, Maimonides and others, have engaged in Bible criticism; not only casting doubts upon the genuineness of various books of the Old Testament, but also denying the miracles and talking learnedly about "myths." Even eighteen hundred years ago Celsus brought forward the same objections as those now raised by modern criticism; and in his weak and bungling production, the "Life of Jesus," David Strauss has in part repeated them. Also there have been other noted

heretics, such as Arius (317 A. D.), who denied the divinity of Christ, and Pelagius in the fifth century, who rejected the doctrine of original sin. Indeed this exceedingly new theology adopts even the unbelief of those old Sadducees who said "there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit" (Acts 23:8), and whom Christ reproved with the words, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God" (Matt. 22:29). It certainly does not argue for the spiritual progress of our race, that such a threadbare and outworn unbelieving kind of science should again, in these days, deceive and even stultify thousands of people.

NO AGREEMENT AMONG THE CRITICS

Do these critics then, to ask the least of them, agree with one another? Far from it. To be sure, they unanimously deny the inspiration of the Bible, the divinity of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, the fall of man and the forgiveness of sins through Christ; also prophecy and miracles, the resurrection of the dead, the final judgment, heaven and hell. But when it comes to their pretendedly sure results, not any two of them affirm the same things; and their numerous publications create a flood of disputable, self-contradictory and mutually destructive hypotheses. For example, the Jehovah of the Old Testament is made to be some heathen god, either a nomadic or steppe god, the weather-god Jahu, or the god of West-Semitism. It was David who first introduced this divinity; and according to some authors the peculiar worship of this god was, with its human sacrifices (!), only a continuation of the Baal-Moloch worship! Of Abraham it is sometimes affirmed that he never existed, but at other times that he was a Canaanite chief, dwelling at Hebron. No! he is the myth of the Aurora; and Sarah, or Scharratu, is the wife of the moon-god Sin, and so on. The twelve sons of Jacob are very probably the twelve months of the year. As to Moses, some teach there never was such a man, also that

the ten commandments were composed in the time of Manasseh. No! the more moderate writers say that Moses is a historical character. It was in Midian that he learned about Jah, the tribal god of the Kenites; and he determined with this divinity to liberate his people. Elijah is simply a myth; or he was some unfortunate prophet who had perhaps been struck by lightning. And so, too, this modern criticism knows for sure that it was not Solomon, but a wholly unknown king, living after the time of Ezra, who wrote Ecclesiastes; also that there never was a Daniel, but that again some unknown author wrote the book bearing that name. Moreover, Kautsch tells us that this book first made its appearance in January, 164 B. C., while other critics are positive that it was in 165. Query: Why could not that unknown author have been named Daniel?

So also Wellhausen knows of twenty-two different authors—all of them, to be sure, unknown—for the books of Moses, while Kuenen is satisfied with sixteen. The noted English critic, Canon Cheyne, is said to have taken great pains to tear the book of Isaiah's prophecies into one hundred and sixty pieces, all by unknown writers; which pieces were scattered through ten different epochs including four and a half centuries ("Modern Puritan," 1907, p. 400). Likewise this critic knows that the first chapter of 1 Samuel originated with an unknown writer living some five hundred years after the time of that prophet; also that Hannah's glory-song, as found in 2 Kings, was written by some other "unknown." That Eli ruled over Israel for forty years is, "in all likelihood," the unauthentic statement of a later day (Hastings' Bible Dictionary). Why so? we may ask.—The book of Deuteronomy was written, we are told, in 561 B. C., and Ecclesiastes in 264 B. C.; and a German critic, Budde, is certain that the book of Job has somehow lost its last chapter, and that fifty-nine verses of this book should be wholly expunged.

Such are a few illustrations of the way in which Holy Scripture is treated by the criticism we are considering.

But, surely, it would not require much sagacity and intelligence for one, by applying such peculiar methods, say, to Goethe's works, to demonstrate critically that a good share of those productions, such as Erlkönig, Iphigenia, Götz von Berlichingen, the Wahlverwandschaften, Faust (Parts I. and II.), belong, if judged of by their style of composition and their historical and philosophical views, to wholly different epochs, and that they originated with many different authors. Moreover, it could easily be shown that none of those authors lived in the times when Napoleon Bonaparte revolutionized Europe, since his name is not mentioned in any of the productions specified.

CRITICISM AS APPLIED TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

Of course this modern criticism does not stop short of the New Testament. This part of the Bible, Harnack says, narrates for us incredible stories respecting the birth and childhood of Christ. "Nevermore," he goes on to assert, "shall we believe that he walked upon the sea and commanded the storm." It stands to reason that He did not rise from the dead. The Fourth Gospel is spurious, and so also is (according to late critical authority) the Epistle to the Romans. The Book of Revelation is only the occasion for derisive laughter on the part of these skeptical critics; and because it is so, the curse mentioned in its last chapter is made applicable to them (vs. 18, 19). Nevertheless, these men sin most seriously against Christ. In their view the very Son of God, the Word that was in the beginning with God, and that was God, and without Whom nothing exists, is only a fanatical young rabbi; entangled in the peculiar views and superstitions of his people; and he died upon the cross only because he misconceived of the character of his own mission and the nature of his times. Jesus "is not indispensable to the Gospel," so writes Harnack.

Now all this is what is denominated Biblical criticism. It is a jumble of mere hypotheses, imaginings and assertions, brought forward often without even the shadow of proof, and with no real certainty. Still, in these times it represents itself to thousands of nominal Christians and to hundreds of miserably deceived theological students who are to become preachers of God's word, as being the "assured results of the latest scientific research." May God have mercy, if such is the case!

WHAT ARE THE FRUITS OF THIS CRITICISM?

Now, if these people were of the truth, and if they would only believe Him who says, "I am the way, the truth and the life," they would not be under the necessity of tediously working their way through the numerous publications (statistics show that there appear in Europe and America annually some eight hundred of these works); but they would find in His teaching a simple and sure means for testing the character of these critical doctrines. "Ye shall know them by their fruits," is what Christ says of the false teachers who came in His name. "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" (Matt. 7:16). Are the fruits of modern criticism good? Where are the grapes or figs that grow on this thorn-bush? Has not this criticism already robbed, and perhaps forever, thousands of people of their first love, their undoubting faith, and their joyous hope? Has it not sowed dissension, fostered pride and self-conceit, and injured before all the world the authority of both the church and its ministers? Has it not offended Christ's "little ones?" (Matt. 18:6, 7). And does it not every day furnish the enemies of God with opportunities for deriding and scorning the truth? Where are the souls that it has led to God—comforting, strengthening, purifying and sanctifying them? Where are the individuals who even in the hour of death have continued to rejoice in the benefits of this criticism?

In the study-room it ensnares, in lecture-halls it makes great pretenses, for mere popular lectures it is still serviceable; but when the thunders of God's power break in upon the soul, when despair at the loss of all one has loved takes possession of the mind, when remembrance of a miserable lost life or of past misdeeds is felt and realized, when one is on a sick-bed and death approaches, and the soul, appreciating that it is now on the brink of eternity, calls for a Savior—just at this time when its help is most needed, this modern religion utterly fails. In the year 1864, in Geneva, one of those modern theologians was summoned to prepare for execution a young man who had committed murder and robbery. But he candidly exclaimed, "Call some one else, I have nothing to say to him." This incompetent criticism did not know of any consolation for the sin-burdened soul; therefore an orthodox clergyman was obtained, and the wretched man, murderer though he was, died reconciled to God through the blood of Christ.

But suppose that all the teachings of this criticism were true, what would it avail us? It would put us in a sad condition indeed. For then, sitting beside ruined temples and broken-down altars, with no joy as respects the hereafter, no hope of everlasting life, no God to help us, no forgiveness of sins, feeling miserable, all desolate in our hearts and chaotic in our minds, we should be utterly unable either to know or believe anything more. Can such a view of the world, such a religion, which, as was said of Professor Harnack's lectures in America, only destroys, removes and tears down, be true? No! If this modern criticism is true, then away with all so-called Christianity, which only deceives us with idle tales! Away with a religion which has nothing to offer us but the commonplace teachings of morality! Away with faith! Away with hope! Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die!

THESE TEACHINGS IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURE

But let us hear what God's word has to say regarding this topic:

2 Pet. 1:21.—"For no prophecy ever came by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

2 Tim. 3:16, 17.—"All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Gal. 1:11, 12.—"I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached by me is not after man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

Rom. 1:16.—"I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

Acts 20:30.—But "of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."

2 Pet. 2:1.—"There were false prophets also among the people, * * * who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them."

1 Cor. 1:20, 21.—"Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe."

Col. 2:4-8.—"This I say, lest any man should beguile you with enticing words," or "spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."

1 Cor. 3:19.—"For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God."

1 Cor. 2:5.—"That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

1 Cor. 2:4.—"And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power."

1 Cor. 2:12, 13.—"Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual."

Col. 1:21 and 2 Cor. 10:5.—Therefore "you that were sometime alienated and enemies in your minds by wicked works," now "bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

Gal. 1:9.—"As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."

1 Cor. 15:17.—"Whosoever says that Christ is not risen, his faith is vain, he is yet in his sins."

2 John, vs. 7, 9, 10, 11.—"For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. * * * Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."

Luke 11:52.—"Woe unto you lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered."

CONCLUSION

Let us then, by repudiating this modern criticism, show our condemnation of it. What does it offer us? Nothing. What does it take away? Everything. Do we have any

use for it? No! It neither helps us in life nor comforts us in death; it will not judge us in the world to come. For our Biblical faith we do not need either the encomiums of men, nor the approbation of a few poor sinners. We will not attempt to improve the Scriptures and adapt them to our liking, but we will believe them. We will not criticize them, but we will ourselves be directed by them. We will not exercise authority over them, but we will obey them. We will trust Him who is the way, the truth, and the life. His word shall make us free.

Respice finem, "consider the end"—that is what even the old Romans said. True rationalism adjudges all things from the standpoint of eternity; and it asks of every religion, What can you do for me with regard to the great beyond? What does this Biblical criticism offer us here? Only fog and mist, or, at best, an endless state of indecision, something impersonal and inactive, just like its god, whose very nature is inconceivable. "Eternal life," writes one of these modernists, "is only the infinitely weak vestige of the present life." (!) Here also the maxim proves itself true, "By their fruits ye shall know them." Just as for our present life this criticism offers us no consolation, no forgiveness of sins, no deliverance from "the fear of death, through which we are all our lifetime subject to bondage," so also it knows nothing respecting the great beyond—nothing with regard to that new heaven and new earth wherein righteousness shall dwell, nothing with regard to that golden city which shines with eternal light, nothing with regard to a God who wipes away all tears from our eyes. It is utterly ignorant of the glory of God, and on that account it stands condemned.

"Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God" (John 6:68, 69). And He answered, "Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast; that no man take thy crown" (Rev. 3:11).

CHAPTER V

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND MODERN NEGATIONS

BY PROFESSOR JAMES ORR, D. D.,
UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW, SCOTLAND

Is there today in the midst of criticism and unsettlement a tenable doctrine of Holy Scripture for the Christian Church and for the world; and if there is, what is that doctrine? That is unquestionably a very pressing question at the present time. "Is there a book which we can regard as the repository of a true revelation of God and an infallible guide in the way of life, and as to our duties to God and man?" is a question of immense importance to us all. Fifty years ago, perhaps less than that, the question hardly needed to be asked among Christian people. It was universally conceded, taken for granted, that there is such a book, the book which we call the Bible. Here, it was believed, is a volume which is an inspired record of the whole will of God for man's salvation; accept as true and inspired the teaching of that book, follow its guidance, and you cannot stumble, you cannot err in attaining the supreme end of existence, in finding salvation, in grasping the prize of a glorious immortality.

Now, a change has come. There is no disguising the fact that we live in an age when, even within the Church, there is much uneasy and distrustful feeling about the Holy Scriptures—a hesitancy to lean upon them as an authority and to use them as the weapons of precision they once were; with a corresponding anxiety to find some surer basis in external Church authority, or with others, in Christ Himself, or again in a Christian consciousness, as it is named,—a surer basis for Christian belief and life. We often hear in these days reference to the substitution, in Protestantism, of an "INFAL-

LIBLE BIBLE FOR AN INFALLIBLE CHURCH", and the implication is that the one idea is just as baseless as the other. Sometimes the idea is taken up, quite commonly perhaps, that the thought of an authority external to ourselves—to our own reason or conscience or spiritual nature—must be wholly given up; that only that can be accepted which carries its authority within itself by the appeal it makes to reason or to our spiritual being, and therein lies the judge for us of what is true and what is false.

That proposition has an element of truth in it; it may be true or may be false according as we interpret it. However, as it is frequently interpreted it leaves the Scriptures—but more than that, it leaves Jesus Christ Himself—without any authority for us save that with which our own minds see fit to clothe Him. But in regard to the INFALLIBLE BIBLE AND THE INFALLIBLE CHURCH, it is proper to point out that there is a considerable difference between these two things—between the idea of an authoritative Scripture and the idea of an infallible Church or an infallible Pope, in the Roman sense of that word. It may be a clever antithesis to say that Protestantism substituted the idea of an infallible Book for the older Romish dogma of an infallible Church; but the antithesis, the contrast, unfortunately has one fatal inaccuracy about it. The idea of the authority of Scripture is not younger, but older than Romanism. It is not a late invention of Protestantism. It is not something that Protestants invented and substituted for the Roman conception of the infallible Church; but *it is the original conception that lies in the Scriptures themselves.* There is a great difference there. It is a belief—this belief in the Holy Scripture—which was accepted and acted upon by the Church of Christ from the first. The Bible itself claims to be an authoritative Book, and an infallible guide to the true knowledge of God and of the way of salvation. This view is implied in every reference

made to it, so far as it then existed, by Christ and His Apostles. That the New Testament, the work of the Apostles and of apostolic men, does not stand on a lower level of inspiration and authority than the Old Testament, is, I think, hardly worth arguing. And in that sense, as a body of writings of Divine authority, the books of the Old and the New Testament were accepted by the Apostles and by the Church of the post-apostolic age.

Take the writings of any of the early Church fathers—I have waded through them wearily as teacher of Church History—take Tertullian or Origen, or others, and you will find their words saturated with references to Scripture. You will find the Scriptures treated in precisely the same way as they are used in the Biblical literature of today; namely, as the ultimate authority on the matters of which they speak. I really do the fathers an injustice in this comparison, for I find things said and written about the Holy Scriptures by teachers of the Church today which those early fathers would never have permitted themselves to utter. It has now become fashionable among a class of religious teachers to speak disparagingly of or belittle the Holy Scriptures as an authoritative rule of faith for the Church. The leading cause of this has undoubtedly been the trend which the criticism of the Holy Scriptures has assumed during the last half century or more.

By all means, let criticism have its rights. Let purely literary questions about the Bible receive full and fair discussion. Let the structure of books be impartially examined. If a reverent science has light to throw on the composition or authority or age of these books, let its voice be heard. If this thing is of God we cannot overthrow it; if it be of man, or so far as it is of man, or so far as it comes in conflict with the reality of things in the Bible, it will come to naught—as in my opinion a great deal of it is fast coming today through its own excesses. No fright, therefore, need be taken at the mere word, "Criticism."

On the other hand, we are not bound to accept every wild critical theory that any critic may choose to put forward and assert, as the final word on this matter. We are entitled, nay, we are bound, to look at the presuppositions on which each criticism proceeds, and to ask, How far is the criticism controlled by those presuppositions? We are bound to look at the evidence by which the theory is supported, and to ask, Is it really borne out by that evidence? And when theories are put forward with every confidence as fixed results, and we find them, as we observe them, still in constant process of evolution and change, constantly becoming more complicated, more extreme, more fanciful, we are entitled to inquire, Is this the certainty that it was alleged to be? *Now that is my complaint against much of the current criticism of the Bible* —not that it is criticism, but that it starts from the wrong basis, that it proceeds by arbitrary methods, and that it arrives at results which I think are demonstrably false results. That is a great deal to say, no doubt, but perhaps I shall have some justification to offer for it before I am done.

I am not going to enter into any general tirade against criticism; but it is useless to deny that a great deal of what is called criticism is responsible for the uncertainty and unsettlement of feeling existing at the present time about the Holy Scriptures. I do not speak especially of those whose philosophical standpoint compels them to take up an attitude of negation to supernatural revelation, or to books which profess to convey such a revelation. Criticism of this kind, criticism that starts from the basis of the denial of the supernatural, has of course, to be reckoned with. In its hands everything is engineered from that basis. There is the denial to begin with, that God ever has entered into human history, in word and deed, in any supernatural way. The necessary result is that whatever in the Bible affirms or flows from such interposition of God is expounded or explained away. *The Scriptures on this showing, instead of being the living ora-*

cles of God, become simply the fragmentary remains of an ancient Hebrew literature, the chief value of which would seem to be the employment it affords to the critic to dissect it into its various parts, to overthrow the tradition of the past in regard to it, and to frame ever new, ever changing, ever more wonderful theories of the origin of the books and the so-called legends they contain. Leaving, however, such futile, rationalistic criticism out of account—because that is not the kind of criticism with which we as Christian people have chiefly to deal in our own circles—there is certainly an immense change of attitude on the part of many who still sincerely hold faith in the supernatural revelation of God. I find it difficult to describe this tendency, for I am desirous not to describe it in any way which would do injustice to any Christian thinker, and it is attended by so many signs of an ambiguous character. Jesus is recognized by the majority of those who represent it as "the Incarnate Son of God," though with shadings off into more or less indefinite assertions even on that fundamental article, which make it sometimes doubtful where the writers exactly stand. The process of thought in regard to Scripture is easily traced. First, there is an ostentatious throwing overboard, joined with some expression of contempt, of what is called the verbal inspiration of Scripture—a very much abused term. Jesus is still spoken of as the highest revealer, and it is allowed that His words, if only we could get at them—and on the whole it is thought we can—furnish the highest rule of guidance for time and for eternity. But even criticism, we are told, must have its rights. Even in the New Testament the Gospels go into the crucible, and in the name of synoptical criticism, historical criticism, they are subject to wonderful processes, in the course of which much of the history gets melted out or is peeled off as Christian characteristics. Jesus, we are reminded, was still a man of His generation, liable to error in His human knowledge, and allowance must be made for the

limitations in His conceptions and judgments. Paul is alleged to be still largely dominated by his inheritance of Rabbinical and Pharisaic ideas. He had been brought up a Pharisee, brought up with the rabbis, and when he became a Christian, he carried a great deal of that into his Christian thought, and we have to strip off that thought when we come to the study of his Epistles. He is therefore a teacher not to be followed further than our own judgment of Christian truth leads us. That gets rid of a great deal that is inconvenient about Paul's teaching.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE CRITICS

If these things are done in the "green tree" of the New Testament, it is easy to see what will be done in the "dry tree" of the Old. The conclusions of the more advanced school of critics are here generally accepted as once for all settled, with the result—in my judgment, at any rate—that the Old Testament is immeasurably lowered from the place it once held in our reverence. Its earlier history, down to about the age of the kings, is largely resolved into myths and legends and fictions. It is ruled out of the category of history proper. No doubt we are told that the legends are just as good as the history, and perhaps a little better, and that the ideas which they convey to us are just as good, coming in the form of legends, as if they came in the form of fact.

But behold, its laws, when we come to deal with them in this manner, lack Divine authority. They are the products of human minds at various ages. Its prophecies are the utterances of men who possessed indeed the Spirit of God, which is only in fuller degree what other good men, religious teachers in all countries, have possessed—not a spirit qualifying, for example, to give real predictions, or to bear authoritative messages of the truth to men. And so, in this whirl and confusion of theories—you will find them in our magazines, you will find them in our encyclopedias, you will find them in our re-

views, you will find them in many books which have appeared to annihilate the conservative believers—in this whirl and confusion of theories, is it any wonder that many should be disquieted and unsettled, and feel as if the ground on which they have been wont to rest was giving way beneath their feet? And so the question comes back with fresh urgency. What is to be said of the place and value of Holy Scripture?

IS THERE A TENABLE DOCTRINE FOR THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH OF TODAY?

One of the urgent needs of our time, and a prime need of the Church, is just a replacement of Holy Scripture, with due regard, I grant, to any really ascertained facts in regard to its literary history, in the faith and lives of men, as the truly inspired and divinely sealed record of God's revealed will for men in great things of the soul. But then, is such a position tenable? In the fierce light of criticism that beats upon the documents and upon the revelation of God's grace they profess to contain, can this position be maintained? I venture to think, indeed, I am very sure, it can. Let me try to indicate—for I can do hardly any more—the lines along which I would answer the question, Have we or can we have a tenable doctrine of Holy Scripture?

For a satisfactory doctrine of Holy Scripture—and by that I mean a doctrine which is satisfactory for the needs of the Christian Church, a doctrine which answers to the claim the Scripture makes for itself, to the place it holds in Christian life and Christian experience, to the needs of the Christian Church for edification and evangelization, and in other ways—I say, for a satisfactory doctrine of Holy Scripture it seems to me that three things are indispensably necessary. There is necessary, *first,* a more positive view of the structure of the Bible than at present obtains in many circles. There is necessary, *second,* the acknowledgment of

a true supernatural revelation of God in the history and religion of the Bible. There is necessary, *third*, the recognition of a true supernatural inspiration in the record of that revelation. These three things, to my mind, go together—a more positive view of the structure of the Bible; the recognition of the supernatural revelation embodied in the Bible; and a recognition in accordance with the Bible's own claim of a supernatural inspiration in the record of the Bible. Can we affirm these three things? Will they bear the test? I think they will.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE BIBLE

First as to the structure of the Bible, there is needed a more positive idea of that structure than is at present prevalent. You take much of the criticism and you find the Bible being disintegrated in many ways, and everything like structure falling away from it. You are told, for example, that these books—say the Books of Moses—are made up of many documents, which are very late in origin and cannot claim historical value. You are told that the laws they contain are also, for the most part, of tolerably late origin, and the Levitical laws especially are of post-exilian construction; they were not given by Moses; they were unknown when the Children of Israel were carried into captivity. Their temple usage perhaps is embodied in the Levitical law, but most of the contents of that Levitical law were wholly unknown. They were the construction—the invention, to use a term lately employed—of priests and scribes in the post-exilian period. They were put into shape, brought before the Jewish community returned from Babylon, and accepted by it as the law of life. Thus you have the history of the Bible turned pretty much upside down, and things take on a new aspect altogether.

Must I then, in deference to criticism, accept these theories, and give up the structure which the Bible presents? Taking

the Bible as it stands, I find—and you will find if you look there also, without any particular critical learning you will find it—what seems to be evidence of a very definite internal structure, part fitting into part and leading on to part, making up a unity of the whole in that Bible. The Bible has undeniably a structure as it stands. It is distinguished from all other books of the kind, from all sacred books in the world, from Koran and Buddhist scriptures and Indian scriptures and every other kind of religious books. It is distinguished just by this fact, that it is the embodiment of a great plan or scheme or purpose of Divine grace extending from the beginning of time through successive ages and dispensations down to its culmination in Jesus Christ and the Pentecostal outpourings of the Spirit. The *history* of the Bible is the history of that development of God's redemptive purpose. The *promises* of the Bible mark the stages of its progress and its hope. The *covenants* of the Bible stand before us in the order of its unfolding. You begin with Genesis. Genesis lays the foundation and leads up to the Book of Exodus; and the Book of Exodus, with its introduction of the law-giving, leads up to what follows. Deuteronomy looks back upon the history of the rebellions and the laws given to the people, and leads up to the conquest. I need not follow the later developments, coming away down through the monarchy and the prophecy and the rest, but you find it all gathered up and fulfilled in the New Testament. The Bible, as we have it, closes in Gospel and Epistle and Apocalypse, fulfilling all the ideas of the Old Testament. There the circle completes itself with the new heaven and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. Here is a structure; here is the fact; here is a structure, a connected story, a unity of purpose extending through this Book and binding all its parts together. Is that structure an illusion? Do we only, and many with us, dream that it is there? Do our eyes de-

ceive us when we think we see it? Or has somebody of a later date invented it, and put it all, inwrought it all, in these earlier records, legends and stories, or whatever you like to call it—skilfully woven into the story until it presents there the appearance of naturalness and truth? I would like to find the mind capable of inventing it, and then the mind capable of putting it in and working it into a history once they got the idea itself. But if not invented, it belongs to the reality and the substance of the history; it belongs to the facts; and therefore to the Book that records the facts. And there are internal attestations in that structure of the Bible to the genuineness of its contents that protest against the efforts that are so often made to reduce it to fragments and shiver up that unity and turn it upside down. "Walk about Zion . . . tell the towers thereof; mark ye well her bulwarks;" you will find there's something there which the art of man will not avail to overthrow.

"Now, that is all very well," I hear some one say, "but there are facts on the other side; there are those manifold proofs which our critical friends adduce that the Bible is really a collection of fragments and documents of much later date, and that the history is really quite a different thing from what the Bible represents it to be." Well, are we to sit down and accept their dictum on that subject without evidence? When I turn to the evidence I do not find them to have that convincing power which our critical friends assign to them.

I am not rejecting this kind of critical theory because it goes against my prejudices or traditions; I reject it simply because it seems to me the evidence does not sustain it, and that the stronger evidence is against it. I cannot go into details; but take just the one point that I have mentioned—this post-exilian origin of the Levitical law. I have stated what is said about that matter—that those laws and institutions

that you find in the middle of the Books of the Pentateuch—those laws and institutions about priests and Levites and sacrifices and all that—had really no existence, had no authoritative form, and to a large extent had not existence of any kind until after the Jews returned from Babylon, and then they were given out as a code of laws which the Jews accepted. That is the theory which is stated once and again. But let the reader put himself in the position of that returned community, and see what the thing means. These exiles had returned from Babylon. They had been organized into a new community. They had rebuilt their Temple, and then long years after that, when things had got into confusion, those two great men, Ezra and Nehemiah, came among them, and by and by Ezra produced and publicly proclaimed this law of Moses—what he called the law of Moses, the law of God by the hand of Moses—which he had brought from Babylon. A full description of what happened is given in the eighth chapter of the Book of Nehemiah. Ezra reads that law from his pulpit of wood day after day to the people, and the interpreter gives the sense. Now, mind you, most of the things in this law, in this book that he is reading to the people, had never been heard of before—never had existed, in fact; priests and Levites such as are there described had never existed. The law itself was long and complicated and burdensome, but the marvelous thing is that the people meekly accept it all as true—meekly accept it as law, at any rate—and submit to it, and take upon themselves its burdens without a murmur of dissent.

That is a very remarkable thing to start with. But remember, further, what that community was. It was not a community with oneness of mind, but it was a community keenly divided in itself. If you read the narrative you will find that there were strong opposing factions in that community; there were parties strongly opposed to Ezra and

Nehemiah and their reforms; there were many, as you see in the Book of Malachi, who were religiously faithless in that community. But marvelous to say, they all join in accepting this new and burdensome and hitherto unheard of law as the law of Moses, the law coming down to them from hoary antiquity. There were priests and Levites in that community who knew something about their own origin; they had genealogies and knew something about their own past. According to the new theory, these Levites were quite a new order; they had never existed at all before the time of the exile, and they had come into existence through the sentence of degradation that the prophet Ezekiel had passed upon them in the 44th chapter of his book. History is quite silent about this degradation. If anyone asks who carried out the degradation, or why was it carried out, or when was it done, and how came the priests to submit to the degradation, there is no answer to be given at all. But it came about somehow, so we are told.

And so these priests and Levites are there, and they stand and listen without astonishment as they learn from Ezra how the Levites had been set apart long centuries before in the wilderness by the hand of God, and had an ample tithe provision made for their support, and cities, and what not, set apart for them to live in. People know a little about their past. These cities never had existed except on paper; but they took it all in. They are told about these cities, which they must have known had never existed as Levitical cities. They not only hear but they accept the heavy tithe burdens without a word of remonstrance, and they make a covenant with God pledging themselves to faithful obedience to all those commands. Those tithes laws, as we discover, had no actual relation to their situation at all. They were drawn up for a totally different case. They were drawn up for a state of things in which there were few priests and many Levites. The priests were only to get the tithe of a tenth, but in this

restored community there were a great many priests and few Levites. The tithe laws did not apply at all, but they accepted these as laws of Moses.

And so I might go over the provisions of the law one by one—tabernacle and priests and ritual and sacrifices and Day of Atonement—these things, in their post-exilian form, had never existed; they were spun out of the inventive brains of scribes; and yet the people accepted them all as the genuine handiwork of the ancient law-giver. Was ever such a thing heard of before? Try it in any city. Try to get the people to take upon themselves a series of heavy burdens of taxation or tithes or whatever you like, on the ground that it had been handed down from the middle ages to the present time. Try to get them to believe it; try to get them to obey it, and you will find the difficulty. Is it credible to anyone who leaves books and theories in the study and takes a broad view of human nature with open eyes? I aver that for me, at any rate, it is not; and it will be a marvel to me as long as I am spared to live, how such a theory has ever gained the acceptance it has done among unquestionably able and sound-minded men. I am convinced that the structure of the Bible vindicates itself, and that these counter theories break down.

A SUPERNATURAL REVELATION

I think it is an essential element in a tenable doctrine of Scripture, in fact the core of the matter, that it contains a record of a true supernatural revelation; and that is what the Bible claims to be—not a development of man's thoughts about God, and not what this man and that one came to think about God, how they came to have the ideas of a Jehovah or Yahveh, who was originally the storm-god of Sinai, and how they manufactured out of this the great universal God of the prophets—but a supernatural revelation of what God revealed Himself in word and deed to men in history. And

if that claim to a supernatural revelation from God falls, the Bible falls, because it is bound up with it from beginning to end. Now, it is just here that a great deal of our modern thought parts company with the Bible. I am quite well aware that many of our friends who accept these newer critical theories, claim to be just as firm believers in Divine revelation as I am myself, and in Jesus Christ and all that concerns Him. I rejoice in the fact, and I believe that they are warranted in saying that there is that in the religion of Israel which you cannot expunge, or explain on any other hypothesis but Divine revelation.

But what I maintain is that this theory of the religion of the Bible which has been evolved, which has peculiarly come to be known as the critical view, had a very different origin—in men who did not believe in the supernatural revelation of God in the Bible. This school as a whole, as a widespread school, holds the fundamental position—the position which its adherents call that of the modern mind—that miracles did not happen and cannot happen. It takes the ground that they are impossible; therefore its followers have to rule everything of that kind out of the Bible record.

I have never been able to see how that position is tenable to a believer in a living personal God who really loves His creatures and has a sincere desire to bless them. Who dare to venture to assert that the power and will of such a Being as we must believe God to be—the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—is exhausted in the natural creation? That there are no higher things to be attained in God's providence than can be attained through the medium of natural law? That there is in such a Being no capability of revealing Himself in words and deeds beyond nature? If there is a dogmatism in the world, it is that of the man who claims to limit the Author of the universe by this finite bound. We are told sometimes that it is a far higher thing to see God in the natural than to see Him in something that transcends the

natural; a far higher thing to see God in the orderly regular working of nature than to suppose that there has ever been anything transcending that ordinary natural working. I think we all do see God, and try to see Him more and more, in the ordinary and regular working of nature. I hope all try every day to see God there. But the question is, Has this natural working not its limits? Is there not something that nature and natural workings cannot reach, cannot do for men, that we need to have done for us? And are we so to bind God that He cannot enter into communion with man in a supernatural economy of grace, an economy of revelation, an economy of salvation? Are we to deny that He has done so? That is really the dividing line both in Old Testament and New between the different theories. *Revelation,* surely, all must admit if man is to attain the clear knowledge of God that is needed; and the question is one of fact, Has God so revealed Himself? And I believe that it is an essential part of the answer, the true doctrine of Scripture, to say, "Yes, God has so revealed Himself, and the Bible is the record of that revelation, and that revelation shines in its light from the beginning to the end of it." And unless there is a wholehearted acceptance of the fact that God has entered, in word and deed, into human history for man's salvation, for man's renovation, for the deliverance of this world, a revelation culminating in the great Revealer Himself—unless we accept that, we do not get the foundation for the true doctrine of Holy Scripture.

THE INSPIRED BOOK

Now, just a word in closing, on Inspiration. I do not think that anyone will weigh the evidence of the Bible itself very carefully without saying that at least it claims to be in a peculiar and especial manner an *inspired book.* There is hardly anyone, I think, who will doubt that Jesus Christ treats the Old Testament in that way. Christ treats it as

an imperfect stage of revelation, no doubt. Christ, as the Son of Man, takes up a lordly, discretionary attitude towards that revelation, and He supersedes very much what is in it by something higher, but Christ recognizes that there was true Divine revelation there, that He was the goal of it all; He came to fulfil the law and the prophets. The Scriptures are the last word with Him—"*Have ye not read?*" "*Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures.*" And it is just as certain that the Apostles treated the Old Testament in that way, and that they claimed in a peculiar sense the Spirit of God themselves. They claimed that in them and in their word was laid "the foundation on which the Church was built," Jesus Christ Himself, as the substance of their testimony, being the chief corner-stone; "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets." And if you say, "Well, are these New Testament Apostles and Prophets?" That is in Ephesians, 2nd chapter. You go to the fifth verse of the third chapter and you find this mystery of Christ which God had revealed to His holy Apostles and Prophets by His Spirit; and it is on that the Church was built. And when you come to Timothy (2 Tim. 3:14-17) to that classical passage, you find the marks there by which inspired Scripture is distinguished.

Take the book of Scripture and ask just this question: Does it answer to the claim of this inspired volume? How are we to test this? I do not enter here into the question that has divided good men as to theories of inspiration—questions about inerrancy in detail, and other matters. I want to get away from these things at the circumference to the center. But take the broader test.

THE BIBLE'S OWN TEST OF INSPIRATION

What does the Bible itself give us as the test of its inspiration? What does the Bible itself name as the qualities that inspiration imparts to it? Paul speaks in Timothy of the

Sacred Writings that were able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. He goes on to tell us that *ALL Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, in order that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.* When you go back to the Old Testament and its praise of the Word of God you will find the qualities of inspiration are just the same. "The law of the Lord is perfect", etc. Those are the qualities which the inspired Book is alleged to sustain—qualities which only a true inspiration of God's Spirit could give; qualities beyond which we surely do not need anything more.

Does anyone doubt that the Bible possesses these qualities? Look at its structure; look at its completeness; look at it in the clearness and fullness and holiness of its teachings; look at it in its sufficiency to guide every soul that truly seeks light unto the saving knowledge of God. Take the Book as a whole, in its whole purpose, its whole spirit, its whole aim and tendency, and the whole setting of it, and ask, Is there not manifest the power which you can only trace back, as it traces back itself, to God's Holy Spirit really in the men who wrote it?

CHAPTER VI

CHRIST AND CRITICISM.

BY SIR ROBERT ANDERSON, K. C. B., LL. D.

AUTHOR OF "THE BIBLE AND MODERN CRITICISM," ETC., ETC.,
LONDON, ENGLAND.

In his "Founders of Old Testament Criticism" Professor Cheyne of Oxford gives the foremost place to Eichhorn. He hails him, in fact, as *the* founder of the cult. And according to this same authority, what led Eichhorn to enter on his task was "his hope to contribute to the winning back of the educated classes to religion." The rationalism of Germany at the close of the eighteenth century would accept the Bible only on the terms of bringing it down to the level of a human book, and the problem which had to be solved was to get rid of the element of miracle which pervades it. Working on the labors of his predecessors, Eichhorn achieved this to his own satisfaction by appealing to the oriental habit of thought, which seizes upon ultimate causes and ignores intermediate processes. This commended itself on two grounds. It had an undoubted element of truth, and it was consistent with reverence for Holy Scripture. For of the founder of the "Higher Criticism" it was said, what cannot be said of any of his successors, that "faith in that which is holy, even in the miracles of the Bible, was never shattered by Eichhorn in any youthful mind."

In the view of his successors, however, Eichhorn's hypothesis was open to the fatal objection that it was altogether inadequate. So the next generation of critics adopted the more drastic theory that the Mosaic books were "mosaic" in the sense that they were literary forgeries of a late date, composed of materials supplied by ancient documents and the myths and legends of the Hebrew race. And though this theory has been

modified from time to time during the last century, it remains substantially the "critical" view of the Pentateuch. But it is open to two main objections, either of which would be fatal. It is inconsistent with the evidence. And it directly challenges the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ as a teacher; for one of the few undisputed facts in this controversy is that our Lord accredited the books of Moses as having divine authority.

THE TRUE AND THE COUNTERFEIT.

It may be well to deal first with the least important of these objections. And here we must distinguish between the true Higher Criticism and its counterfeit. The rationalistic "Higher Criticism," when putting the Pentateuch upon its trial, began with the verdict and then cast about to find the evidence; whereas, true criticism enters upon its inquiries with an open mind and pursues them without prejudice. The difference may be aptly illustrated by the position assumed by a typical French judge and by an ideal English judge in a criminal trial. The one aims at convicting the accused, the other at elucidating the truth. "The proper function of the Higher Criticism is to determine the origin, date, and literary structure of an ancient writing." This is Professor Driver's description of *true* criticism. But the aim of the counterfeit is to disprove the genuineness of the ancient writings. The justice of this statement is established by the fact that Hebraists and theologians of the highest eminence, whose investigation of the Pentateuch problem has convinced them of the genuineness of the books, are not recognized at all.

In Britain, at least—and I am not competent to speak of Germany or America—no theologian of the first rank has adopted their "assured results." But the judgment of such men as Pusey, Lightfoot and Salmon, not to speak of men who are still with us, they contemptuously ignore; for the rationalistic Higher Critic is not one who investigates the evidence, but one who accepts the verdict.

THE PHILOLOGICAL INQUIRY.

If, as its apostles sometimes urge, the Higher Criticism is a purely philological inquiry, two obvious conclusions follow. The first is that its verdict must be in favor of the Mosaic books; for each of the books contains peculiar words suited to the time and circumstances to which it is traditionally assigned. This is admitted, and the critics attribute the presence of such words to the Jesuitical skill of the priestly forgers. But this only lends weight to the further conclusion that Higher Criticism is wholly incompetent to deal with the main issue on which it claims to adjudicate. For the genuineness of the Pentateuch must be decided on the same principles on which the genuineness of ancient documents is dealt with in our courts of justice. And the language of the documents is only one part of the needed evidence, and not the most important part. And fitness for dealing with evidence depends upon qualities to which Hebraists, as such, have no special claim. Indeed, their writings afford signal proofs of their unfitness for inquiries which they insist on regarding as their special preserve.

Take, for example, Professor Driver's grave assertion that the presence of two Greek words in Daniel (they are the names of musical instruments) *demand* a date for the book subsequent to the Greek conquest. It has been established by Professor Sayce and others that the intercourse between Babylon and Greece in, and before, the days of Nebuchadnezzar would amply account for the presence in the Chaldean capital of musical instruments with Greek names. And Colonel Conder, moreover,—a very high authority—considers the words to be Akkadian, and not Greek at all! But apart from all this, we can imagine the reception that would be given to such a statement by any competent tribunal. The story bears repeating—it is a record of facts—that at a church bazaar in Lincoln some years ago, the alarm was raised that pickpockets were at work,

and two ladies had lost their purses. The empty purses were afterwards found in the pocket of the Bishop of the Diocese! On the evidence of the two purses the Bishop should be convicted as a thief, and on the evidence of the two words the book of Daniel should be convicted as a forgery!

HISTORICAL BLUNDER.

Here is another typical item in the Critics' indictment of Daniel. The book opens by recording Nebuchadnezzar's siege of Jerusalem in the third year of Jehoiakim, a statement the correctness of which is confirmed by history, sacred and secular. Berosus, the Chaldean historian, tells us that during this expedition Nebuchadnezzar received tidings of his father's death, and that, committing to others the care of his army and of his Jewish and other prisoners, "he himself hastened home across the desert." But the German skeptics, having decided that Daniel was a forgery, had to find evidence to support their verdict. And so they made the brilliant discovery that Berosus was here referring to the expedition of the following year, when Nebuchadnezzar won the battle of Carchemish against the army of the king of Egypt, and that he had not at that time invaded Judea at all. But Carchemish is on the Euphrates, and the idea of "hastening home" from there to Babylon across the desert is worthy of a schoolboy's essay! That he crossed the desert is proof that he set out from Judea; and his Jewish captives were, of course, Daniel and his companion princes. His invasion of Judea took place before his accession, in Jehoiakam's *third* year, whereas the battle of Carchemish was fought after his accession, in the king of Judah's *fourth* year, as the biblical books record. But this grotesque blunder of Bertholdt's "Book of Daniel" in the beginning of the nineteenth century is gravely reproduced in Professor Driver's "Book of Daniel" at the beginning of the twentieth century.

CRITICAL PROFANITY.

But to return to Moses. According to "the critical hypothesis," the books of the Pentateuch are literary forgeries of the Exilic Era, the work of the Jerusalem priests of those evil days. From the Book of Jeremiah we know that those men were profane apostates; and if "the critical hypothesis" be true, they were infinitely worse than even the prophet's inspired denunciations of them indicate. For no eighteenth century atheist ever sank to a lower depth of profanity than is displayed by their use of the Sacred Name. In the preface to his "Darkness and Dawn," Dean Farrar claims that he "never touches the early preachers of Christianity with the finger of fiction." When his story makes Apostles speak, he has "confined their words to the words of a revelation." But *ex. hyp.*, the authors of the Pentateuch "touched with the finger of fiction" not only the holy men of the ancient days, but their Jehovah God. "Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying." This and kindred formulas are repeated times without number in the Mosaic books. If this be romance, a lower type of profanity is inconceivable, unless it be that of the man who fails to be shocked and revolted by it.

But no; facts prove that this judgment is unjust. For men of unfeigned piety and deep reverence for divine things can be so blinded by the superstitions of "religion" that the *imprimatur* of the church enables them to regard these discredited books as Holy Scripture. As critics they brand the Pentateuch as a tissue of myth and legend and fraud, but as religionists they assure us that this "implies no denial of its inspiration or disparagement of its contents."*

ERRORS REFUTED BY FACTS.

In controversy it is of the greatest importance to allow opponents to state their position in their own words; and here

*"The Higher Criticism: Three Papers," by Professors Driver and Kirkpatrick.

is Professor Driver's statement of the case against the Books of Moses:

"We can only argue on grounds of probability derived from our view of the progress of the art of writing, or of literary composition, or of the rise and growth of the prophetic tone and feeling in ancient Israel, or of the period at which the traditions contained in the narratives might have taken shape, or of the probability that they would have been written down before the impetus given to culture by the monarchy had taken effect, and similar considerations, for estimating most of which, though plausible arguments on one side or the other may be advanced, a standard on which we can confidently rely scarcely admits of being fixed." ("Introduction," 6th ed., page 123.)

This modest reference to "literary composition" and "the art of writing" is characteristic. It is intended to gloss over the abandonment of one of the chief points in the original attack. Had "Driver's Introduction" appeared twenty years earlier, the assumption that such a literature as the Pentateuch could belong to the age of Moses would doubtless have been branded as an anachronism. For one of the main grounds on which the books were assigned to the latter days of the monarchy was that the Hebrews of six centuries earlier were an illiterate people. And after that error had been refuted by archaelogical discoveries, it was still maintained that a code of laws so advanced, and so elaborate, as that of Moses could not have originated in such an age. This figment, however, was in its turn exploded, when the spade of the explorer brought to light the now famous Code of Khammurabi, the Amraphel of Genesis, who was king of Babylon in the time of Abraham.

Instead, however, of donning the white sheet when confronted by this new witness, the critics, with great effrontery, pointed to the newly-found Code as the original of the laws of Sinai. Such a conclusion is natural on the part of men who treat the Pentateuch as merely human. But the critics cannot have it both ways. The Moses who copied Khammurabi must

have been the real Moses of the Exodus, and not the mythical Moses of the Exile, who wrote long centuries after Khammurabi had been forgotten!

AN INCREDIBLE THEORY.

The evidence of the Khammurabi Code refutes an important count in the critics' indictment of the Pentateuch; but we can call another witness whose testimony demolishes their whole case. The Pentateuch, as we all know, and the Pentateuch alone, constitutes the Bible of the Samaritans. Who, then, were the Samaritans? And how and when did they obtain the Pentateuch? Here again the critics shall speak for themselves. Among the distinguished men who have championed their crusade in Britain there has been none more esteemed, none more scholarly, than the late Professor Robertson Smith; and here is an extract from his "Samaritans" article in the "Encyclopedia Britannica":

"They (the Samaritans) regard themselves as Israelites, descendants of the ten tribes, and claim to possess the orthodox religion of Moses * * * The priestly law, which is throughout based on the practice of the priests in Jerusalem before the Captivity, was reduced to form after the Exile, and was published by Ezra as the law of the rebuilt temple of Zion. The Samaritans must, therefore, have derived their Pentateuch from the Jews after Ezra's reforms." And in the same paragraph he says that, according to the contention of the Samaritans, "not only the temple of Zion, but the earlier temple of Shiloh and the priesthood of Eli, were schismatical." And yet, as he goes on to say, "the Samaritan religion was built on the Pentateuch alone."

Now mark what this implies. We know something of racial bitterness. We know more, unfortunately, of the fierce bitterness of religious strife. And both these elements combined to alienate the Samaritans from the Jews. But more than this, in the post-exilic period distrust and dislike were

turned to intense hatred—"abhorrence" is Robertson Smith's word—by the sternness and contempt with which the Jews spurned their proffered help in the work of reconstruction at Jerusalem, and refused to acknowledge them in any way. And yet we are asked to believe that, at this very time and in these very circumstances, the Samaritans, while hating the Jews much as Orangemen hate the Jesuits, and denouncing the whole Jewish cult as schismatical, not only accepted these Jewish books relating to that cult as the "service books" of their own ritual, but adopted them as their "Bible," to the exclusion even of the writings of their own Israelite prophets, and the venerated and sacred books which record the history of their kings. In the whole range of controversy, religious or secular, was there ever propounded a theory more utterly incredible and preposterous!

ANOTHER PREPOSTEROUS POSITION.

No less preposterous are the grounds on which this conclusion is commended to us. Here is a statement of them, quoted from the standard textbook of the cult, Hasting's "Bible Dictionary":

"There is at least one valid ground for the conclusion that the Pentateuch was first accepted by the Samaritans after the Exile. Why was their request to be allowed to take part in the building of the second temple refused by the heads of the Jerusalem community? Very probably because the Jews were aware that the Samaritans did not as yet possess the Law-Book. It is hard to suppose that otherwise they would have met with this refusal. Further, anyone who, like the present writer, regards the modern criticism of the Pentateuch as essentially correct, has a second decisive reason for adopting the above view." (Professor König's article, "Samaritan Pentateuch," page 68.)

Here are two "decisive reasons" for holding that "the Pentateuch was first accepted by the Samaritans after the Exile." First, because "very probably" it was because they had not

those forged books that the Jews spurned their help; and so they went home and adopted the forged books as their Bible! And, secondly, because criticism has proved that the books were not in existence till then. To characterize the writings of these scholars as they deserve is not a grateful task but the time has come to throw off reserve, when such drivel as this is gravely put forward to induce us to tear from our Bible the Holy Scriptures on which our Divine Lord based His claims to Messiahship.

THE IDEA OF SACRIFICE A REVELATION.

The refutation of the Higher Criticism does not prove that the Pentateuch is inspired of God. The writer who would set himself to establish such a thesis as that within the limits of a Review Article might well be admired for his enthusiasm and daring, but certainly not for his modesty or discretion. Neither does it decide questions which lie within the legitimate province of the true Higher Criticism, as *ex. gr.,* the authorship of Genesis. It is incredible that for the thousands of years that elapsed before the days of Moses, God left His people on earth without a revelation. It is plain, moreover, that many of the ordinances divinely entrusted to Moses were but a renewal of an earlier revelation. The religion of Babylon is clear evidence of such a primeval revelation. How else can the universality of sacrifice be accounted for? Could such a practice have originated in a human brain?

If some demented creature conceived the idea that killing a beast before his enemy's door would propitiate him, his neighbors would no doubt have suppressed him. And if he evolved the belief that his god would be appeased by such an offensive practice, he must have supposed his god to be as mad as himself. The fact that sacrifice prevailed among all races can be explained only by a primeval revelation. And the Bible student will recognize that God thus sought to impress on men that death was the penalty of sin, and to lead them to

look forward to a great blood shedding that would bring life and blessing to mankind. But Babylon was to the ancient world what Rome has been to Christendom. It corrupted every divine ordinance and truth, and perpetuated them as thus corrupted. And in the Pentateuch we have the divine re-issue of the true cult. The figment that the debased and corrupt version was the original may satisfy some professors of Hebrew, but no one who has any practical knowledge of human nature would entertain it.

INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE.

At this stage, however, what concerns us is not the divine authority of the books, but the human error and folly of the critical attack upon them. The only historical basis of that attack is the fact that in the revival under Josiah, "the book of the law" was found in the temple by Hilkiah, the high priest, to whom the young king entrusted the duty of cleansing and renovating the long neglected shrine. A most natural discovery it was, seeing that Moses had in express terms commanded that it should be kept there (2 Kings 22:8; Deut. 31:26). But according to the critics, the whole business was a detestable trick of the priests. For they it was who forged the books and invented the command, and then hid the product of their infamous work where they knew it would be found.

And apart from this, the only foundation for "the assured results of modern criticism," as they themselves acknowledge, consists of "grounds of probability" and "plausible arguments"! In no civilized country would an habitual criminal be convicted of petty larceny on such evidence as this; and yet it is on these grounds that we are called upon to give up the sacred books which our Divine Lord accredited as "the Word of God" and made the basis of His doctrinal teaching.

CHRIST OR CRITICISM?

And this brings us to the second, and incomparably the

graver, objection to "the assured results of modern criticism." That the Lord Jesus Christ identified Himself with the Hebrew Scriptures, and in a very special way with the Book of Moses, no one disputes. And this being so, we must make choice between Christ and Criticism. For if "the critical hypothesis" of the Pentateuch be sustained, the conclusion is seemingly inevitable, either that He was not divine, or that the records of His teaching are untrustworthy.

Which alternative shall we adopt? If the second, then every claim to inspiration must be abandoned, and agnosticism must supplant faith in the case of every fearless thinker. Inspiration is far too great a question for incidental treatment here; but two remarks with respect to it may not be inopportune. Behind the frauds of Spiritualism there lies the fact, attested by men of high character, some of whom are eminent as scientists and scholars, that definite communications are received in precise words from the world of spirits.* And this being so, to deny that the Spirit of God could thus communicate truth to men, or, in other words, to reject verbal inspiration on *a priori* grounds, betrays the stupidity of systematized unbelief. And, secondly, it is amazing that any one who regards the coming of Christ as God's supreme revelation of Himself can imagine that (to put it on no higher ground than "Providence") the Divine Spirit could fail to ensure that mankind should have a trustworthy and true record of His mission and His teaching.

A MORE HOPELESS DILEMMA.

But if the Gospel narrative be authentic, we are driven back upon the alternative that He of whom they speak could not be divine. "Not so," the critics protest, "for did He not Himself confess His ignorance? And is not this explained by the Apostle's statement that in His humiliation He emptied Himself of His Deity?" And the inference drawn from this (to

*The fact that, as the Christian believes, these spirits are demons who personate the dead, does not affect the argument.

quote the standard text-book of the cult) is that the Lord of Glory "held the current Jewish notions respecting the divine authority and revelation of the Old Testament." But even if this conclusion—as portentous as it is profane—could be established, instead of affording an escape from the dilemma in which the Higher Criticism involves its votaries, it would only serve to make that dilemma more hopeless and more terrible. For what chiefly concerns us is not that, *ex. hyp.*, the Lord's doctrinal teaching was false, but that in unequivocal terms, and with extreme solemnity, He declared again and again that His teaching was not His own but His Father's, and that the very words in which He conveyed it were God-given.

A few years ago the devout were distressed by the proceedings of a certain Chicago "prophet," who claimed divine authority for his lucubrations. Kindly disposed people, rejecting a severer estimate of the man and his platform utterances, regarded him merely as a profane fool. Shall the critics betray us into forming a similarly indulgent estimate of —— My pen refuses to complete the sentence!

And will it be believed that the only scriptural basis offered us for this astounding position is a verse in one of the Gospels and a word in one of the Epistles! Passing strange it is that men who handle Holy Scripture with such freedom when it conflicts with their "assured results" should attach such enormous importance to an isolated verse or a single word, when it can be misused to support them. The verse is Mark 13:32, where the Lord says, with reference to His coming again: "Of that day and hour knoweth no one; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." But this follows immediately upon the words: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away."

THE WORDS OF GOD.

The Lord's words were not "inspired"; they were the words of God in a still higher sense. "The people were astonished

at His teaching," we are told, "for He taught them as one having *exousia*." The word occurs again in Acts 1:7, where He says that times and seasons "the Father hath put in His own *exousia*." And this is explained by Phil. 2:6, 7: "He counted it not a prize (or a thing to be grasped) to be on an equality with God, but *emptied* Himself"—the word on which the *kenosis* theory of the critics depends. And He not only stripped Himself of His glory as God; He gave up His liberty as a man. For He never spoke His own words, but only the words which the Father gave Him to speak. And this was the limitation of His "authority"; so that, beyond what the Father gave Him to speak, He knew nothing and was silent.

But when He spoke, "He taught them as one who had authority, and not as their scribes." From their scribes they were used to receive definite teaching, but it was teaching based on "the law and the prophets." But here was One who stood apart and taught them from a wholly different plane. "For," He declared, "I spake not from Myself; but the Father which sent Me, He hath given Me a commandment what I should say and what I should speak. * * * The things, therefore, which I speak, even as the Father hath said unto Me, so I speak" (John 12:49, 50, R. V.).

And let us not forget that it was not merely the substance of His teaching that was divine, but the very language in which it was conveyed. So that in His prayer on the night of the betrayal He could say, not only "I have given them Thy word," but "I have given them *the words* which Thou gavest Me."* His words, therefore, about Moses and the Hebrew Scriptures were not, as the critics, with such daring and seeming profanity, maintain, the lucubrations of a superstitious and ignorant Jew; they were the words of God, and conveyed truth that was divine and eternal.

When in the dark days of the Exile, God needed a prophet

*Both the λόγος and the ῥήματα John 17:8, 14; as again in Chap. 14:10, 24.

who would speak only as He gave him words, He struck Ezekiel dumb. Two judgments already rested on that people—the seventy years' Servitude to Babylon, and then the Captivity—and they were warned that continued impenitence would bring on them the still more terrible judgment of the seventy years' desolations. And till that last judgment fell, Ezekiel remained dumb (Ezek. 3:26; 24:27; 33:22). But the Lord Jesus Christ needed no such discipline. He came to do the Father's will, and no words ever passed His lips save the words given Him to speak.

In this connection, moreover, two facts which are strangely overlooked claim prominent notice. The first is that in Mark 13 the antithesis is not at all between man and God, but between the Son of God and the Father. And the second is that He had been re-invested with all that, according to Phil. 2, He laid aside in coming into the world. "All things have been delivered unto Me of My Father," He declared; and this at a time when the proofs that "He was despised and rejected of men" were pressing on Him. His reassuming the glory awaited His return to heaven, but here on earth the all things were already His (Matt. 11:27).

AFTER THE KENOSIS.

The foregoing is surely an adequate reply to the *kenosis* figment of the critics; but if any should still doubt or cavil, there is another answer which is complete and crushing. Whatever may have been the limitations under which He rested during His ministry on earth, He was released from them when He rose from the dead. And it was in His post-resurrection teaching that He gave the fullest and clearest testimony to the Hebrew Scriptures. Then it was that, *"beginning at Moses,* and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." And again, confirming all His previous teaching about those Scriptures, "He said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you while I was

yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning Me."

And the record adds: "Then opened He their mind that they might understand the Scriptures." And the rest of the New Testament is the fruit of that ministry, enlarged and unfolded by the Holy Spirit given to lead them into all truth. And in every part of the New Testament the Divine authority of the Hebrew Scriptures, and especially of the Books of Moses, is either taught or assumed.

THE VITAL ISSUE.

Certain it is, then, that the vital issue in this controversy is not the value of the Pentateuch, but the Deity of Christ. And yet the present article does not pretend to deal with the truth of the Deity. Its humble aim is not even to establish the authority of the Scriptures, but merely to discredit the critical attack upon them by exposing its real character and its utter feebleness. The writer's method, therefore, has been mainly destructive criticism, the critics' favorite weapon being thus turned against themselves.

A DEMAND FOR CORRECT STATEMENT.

One cannot but feel distress at having to accord such treatment to certain distinguished men whose reverence for divine things is beyond reproach. A like distress is felt at times by those who have experience in dealing with sedition, or in suppressing riots. But when men who are entitled to consideration and respect thrust themselves into "the line of fire," they must take the consequences. These distinguished men will not fail to receive to the full the deference to which they are entitled, if only they will dissociate themselves from the dishonest claptrap of this crusade ("the assured results of modern criticism"; "all scholars are with us"; and so on—bluster and falsehood by which the weak and ignorant are browbeaten or

deceived) and acknowledge that their "assured results" are mere hypotheses, repudiated by Hebraists and theologians as competent and eminent as themselves.

THINGS TO FEAR.

The effects of this "Higher Criticism" are extremely grave. For it has dethroned the Bible in the home, and the good, old practice of "family worship" is rapidly dying out. And great national interests also are involved. For who can doubt that the prosperity and power of the Protestant nations of the world are due to the influence of the Bible upon character and conduct? Races of men who for generations have been taught to think for themselves in matters of the highest moment will naturally excel in every sphere of effort or of enterprise. And more than this, no one who is trained in the fear of God will fail in his duty to his neighbor, but will prove himself a good citizen. But the dethronement of the Bible leads practically to the dethronement of God; and in Germany and America, and now in England, the effects of this are declaring themselves in ways, and to an extent, well fitted to cause anxiety for the future.

CHRIST SUPREME.

If a personal word may be pardoned in conclusion, the writer would appeal to every book he has written in proof that he is no champion of a rigid, traditional "orthodoxy." With a single limitation, he would advocate full and free criticism of Holy Scripture. And that one limitation is that the words of the Lord Jesus Christ shall be deemed a bar to criticism and "an end of controversy" on every subject expressly dealt with in His teaching. "The Son of God is come"; and by Him came both grace and TRUTH. And from His hand it is that we have received the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

CHAPTER VII

OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM AND NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTIANITY

BY PROFESSOR W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D. D.,
WYCLIFFE COLLEGE, TORONTO, CANADA

A large number of Christians feel compelled to demur to the present attitude of many scholars to the Scriptures of the Old Testament. It is now being taught that the patriarchs of Jewish history are not historic persons; that the records connected with Moses and the giving of the law on Sinai are unhistorical; that the story of the tabernacle in the wilderness is a fabricated history of the time of the Exile; that the prophets cannot be relied on in their references to the ancient history of their own people, or in their predictions of the future; that the writers of the New Testament, who assuredly believed in the records of the Old Testament, were mistaken in the historical value they assigned to those records; that our Lord Himself, in His repeated references to the Scriptures of His own nation, and in His assumption of the Divine authority of those Scriptures, and of the reality of the great names they record, was only thinking and speaking as an ordinary Jew of His day, and was as liable to error in matters of history and of criticism as any of them were.

The present paper is intended to give expression to some of the questions that have arisen in the course of personal study, in connection with collegiate work and also during several years of ordinary pastoral ministry. It is often urged that

problems of Old Testament criticism are for experts alone, and can only be decided by them. We venture to question the correctness of this view, especially when it is remembered that to many people "experts" means experts in Hebrew philology only. By all means let us have all possible expert knowledge; but, as Biblical questions are complex, and involve several considerations, we need expert knowledge in archaeology, history, theology, and even spiritual experience, as well as in philology. Every available factor must be taken into account, and the object of the present paper is to emphasize certain elements which appear liable to be overlooked, or at least insufficiently considered.

We do not question for an instant the right of Biblical criticism considered in itself. On the contrary, it is a necessity for all who use the Bible to be "critics" in the sense of constantly using their "judgment" on what is before them. What is called "higher" criticism is not only a legitimate but a necessary method for all Christians, for by its use we are able to discover the facts and the form of the Old Testament Scriptures. Our hesitation, consequently, is not intended to apply to the method, but to what is believed to be an illegitimate, unscientific, and unhistorical use of it. In fact, we base our objections to much modern criticism of the Old Testament on what we regard as a proper use of a true higher criticism.

1. IS THE TESTIMONY OF NINETEEN CENTURIES OF CHRISTIAN HISTORY AND EXPERIENCE OF NO ACCOUNT IN THIS QUESTION?

For nearly eighteen centuries these modern views of the Old Testament were not heard of. Yet this is not to be accounted for by the absence of intellectual power and scholarship in the Church. Men like Origen, Jerome, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Erasmus, Calvin, Luther, Melancthon, to say nothing of the English Puritans and other divines of the seventeenth century, were not intellectually weak or inert, nor

were they wholly void of critical acumen with reference to Holy Scripture. Yet they, and the whole Church with them, never hesitated to accept the view of the Old Testament which had come down to them, not only as a heritage from Judaism, but as endorsed by the apostles. Omitting all reference to our Lord, it is not open to question that the views of St. Paul and St. Peter and St. John about the Old Testament were the views of the whole Christian Church until the end of the eighteenth century. And, making every possible allowance for the lack of historical spirit and of modern critical methods, are we to suppose that the whole Church for centuries never exercised its mind on such subjects as the contents, history, and authority of the Old Testament?

Besides, this is a matter which cannot be decided by intellectual criticism alone. Scripture appeals to conscience, heart and will, as well as to mind; and the Christian consciousness, the accumulated spiritual experience of the body of Christ, is not to be lightly regarded, much less set aside, unless it is proved to be unwarranted by fact. While we do not say that "what is new is not true," the novelty of these modern critical views should give us pause before we virtually set aside the spiritual instinct of centuries of Christian experience.

2. DOES THE NEW CRITICISM READILY AGREE WITH THE HISTORICAL POSITION OF THE JEWISH NATION?

The Jewish nation is a fact in history, and its record is given to us in the Old Testament. There is no contemporary literature to check the account there given, and archaeology affords us assistance on points of detail only, not for any long or continuous period. This record of Jewish history can be proved to have remained the same for many centuries. Yet much of modern criticism is compelled to reconstruct the history of the Jews on several important points. It involves, for instance, a very different idea of the character of the earliest form of Jewish religion from that seen in the Old Testament as it now

stands; its views of the patriarchs are largely different from the conceptions found on the face of the Old Testament narrative; its views of Moses and David are essentially altered from what we have before us in the Old Testament.

Now what is there in Jewish history to support all this reconstruction? Absolutely nothing. We see through the centuries the great outstanding objective fact of the Jewish nation, and the Old Testament is at once the means and the record of their national life. It rose with them, grew with them, and it is to the Jews alone we can look for the earliest testimony to the Old Testament canon.

In face of these facts, it is bare truth to say that the fundamental positions of modern Old Testament criticism are utterly incompatible with the historic growth and position of the Jewish people. Are we not right, therefore, to pause before we accept this subjective reconstruction of history? Let anyone read Wellhausen's article on "Israel" in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, and then ask himself whether he recognizes at all therein the story as given in the Old Testament.

3. ARE THE RESULTS OF THE MODERN VIEW OF THE OLD TESTAMENT REALLY ESTABLISHED?

It is sometimes said that modern criticism is no longer a matter of hypothesis; it has entered the domain of facts. Principal George Adam Smith has gone so far as to say that "modern criticism has won its war against the traditional theories. It only remains to fix the amount of the indemnity." But is this really so? Can we assert that the results of modern criticism are established facts? Indeed Dr. Smith has himself admitted, since writing the above words, that there are questions still open which were supposed to be settled and closed twenty years ago.

In the first place, is the excessive literary analysis of the Pentateuch at all probable or even thinkable on literary grounds? Let anyone work through a section of Genesis as

given by Dr. Driver in his "Introduction", and see whether such a complex combination of authors is at all likely, or whether, even if likely, the various authors can now be distinguished? Is not the whole method far too purely subjective to be probable and reliable?

Further, the critics are not agreed as to the number of documents, or as to the portions to be assigned to each author. A simple instance of this may be given. It is not so many years ago when criticism was content to say that Isa. 40-66, though not by Isaiah, was the work of one author, an unknown prophet of the Exile. But the most recent writers like Duhm, Macfadyen and Wade consider these chapters to be the work of two writers, and that the whole Book of Isaiah (from three authors) did not receive its present form until long after the return from the Exile.

Then, these differences in literary analysis involve differences of interpretation and differences of date, character, and meaning of particular parts of the Old Testament. To prove this, we ask attention to the following extracts from a review of a work on Genesis by Professor Gunkel of Berlin. The review is by Professor Andrew Harper of Melbourne, and appeared in the "Critical Review" for January, 1902. Professor Harper's own position would, we imagine, be rightly characterized as generally favorable to the moderate position of the critical movement. His comments on Gunkel's book are, therefore, all the more noteworthy and significant.

"It will change the whole direction of the conflict as to the early books of the Pentateuch and lead it into more fruitful directions, for it has raised the fundamental question whether the narratives in Genesis are not far older than the authors of the documents marked J. E. P., and whether they are not faithful witnesses to the religion of Israel before prophetic times." "His conclusion will, in many respects, be welcome to those who have felt how incredible some of the assumptions of the Kuenen-Wellhausen school of critics are."

"It will be obvious at a glance what an upsetting of current conceptions in regard to the history of religion must follow if it be accepted."

"They are sufficient, if made good, to upset the whole of the current reconstructions of the religion of Israel. To most readers it will be seen that he has in large part made them good."

"There can be no doubt that his book most skillfully begins a healthy and much-needed reaction. It should, therefore, be read and welcomed by all students of the Old Testament whose minds are open."

In view of Gunkel's position thus endorsed by Professor Harper, is it fair to claim victory for the modern critical theories of the Old Testament? When an able scholar like Professor Harper can speak of a new work as "sufficient to upset the whole of the current reconstructions of the religion of Israel," it is surely premature to speak even in a moment of rhetorical enthusiasm, as Dr. George Adam Smith does, of "victory" and "indemnity." Dr. Smith himself now admits that Gunkel has overturned the Wellhausen theory of the patriarchal narratives. And the same scholar has told us that distinction in the use of the name for God is "too precarious" as the basis of arguments for distinctions of sources. For ourselves we heartily endorse the words of an American scholar when he says:

"We are certain that there will be no final settlement of Biblical questions on the basis of the higher criticism that is now commonly called by that name. Many specific teachings of the system will doubtless abide. But so far forth as it goes upon the assumption that statements of fact in the Scriptures are pretty generally false, so far forth it is incapable of establishing genuinely permanent results."* Sir W. Robertson

*Dr. G. A. Smith, "Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament", p. 35. Dr. Willis J. Beecher, in "The Bible Student and Teacher", January, 1904.

Nicoll, editor of the "British Weekly," remarked quite recently that the "assured results" seem to be vanishing, that no one really knows what they are.

4. IS THE POSITION OF MODERN CRITICISM REALLY COMPATIBLE WITH A BELIEF IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AS A DIVINE REVELATION?

The problem before us is not merely literary, nor only historical; it is essentially religious, and the whole matter resolves itself into one question: Is the Old Testament the record of a Divine revelation? This is the ultimate problem. It is admitted by both sides to be almost impossible to minimize the differences between the traditional and the modern views of the Old Testament. As a reviewer of Dr. George Adam Smith's book, "Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament", rightly says:

"The difference is immense; they involve different conceptions of the relation of God to the world; different views as to the course of Israel's history, the process of revelation, and the nature of inspiration. We cannot be lifted from the old to the new position by the influence of a charming literary style, or by the force of the most enthusiastic eloquence."*

In view of this fundamental difference, the question of the trustworthiness of the Old Testament becomes acute and pressing. In order to test this fairly and thoroughly, let us examine some of the statements made on behalf of the modern view.

We may consider first the rise and progress of religion in Israel. Dr. G. A. Smith says: "It is plain, then, that to whatever heights the religion of Israel afterwards rose, it remained before the age of the great prophets not only similar to, but in all respects above-mentioned identical with, the general Semitic religion; which was not a monotheism, but a polytheism with an opportunity for monotheism at the heart of it, each tribe

*"American Journal of Theology", Vol. VI., p. 114.

being attached to one god, as to their particular Lord and Father."*

Consider what is meant by the phrase, "in all respects above-mentioned identical with the general Semitic religion," as applied to the religion of Israel previous to the eighth century B. C. Can this view be fairly deduced from the Old Testament as we now have it? Still more, is such a view conceivable in the light of the several preceding centuries of God's special dealings with Israel? Wherein, on this assumption, consisted the uniqueness of Israel from the time of Abraham to the eighth century B. C.?

We may next take the character of the narratives of Genesis. The real question at issue is the historical character. Modern criticism regards the account in Genesis as largely mythical and legendary. Yet it is certain that the Jews of the later centuries accepted these patriarchs as veritable personages, and the incidents associated with them as genuine history. St. Paul and the other New Testament writers assuredly held the same view. If, then, they are not historical, surely the truths emphasized by prophets and apostles from the patriarchal stories are so far weakened in their supports?

Take, again, the legislation which in the Pentateuch is associated with Moses, and almost invariably introduced by the phrase, "The Lord spake unto Moses." Modern criticism regards this legislation as unknown until the Exile, or a thousand years after the time of Moses. Is it really possible to accept this as satisfactory? Are we to suppose that "The Lord spake to Moses" is only a well-known literary device intended to invest the utterance with greater importance and more solemn sanction? This position, together with the generally accepted view of modern criticism about the invention of Deuteronomy in the days of Josiah, cannot be regarded as in accordance with historial fact or ethical principle.

Canon Driver and Dr. G. A. Smith, it is true, strongly assert

*"Modern Criticism", p. 130.

the compatibility of the new views with a belief in the Divine authority of the Old Testament, and so far as they themselves are concerned we of course accept their statements *ex animo*. But we wish they would give us more clearly and definitely than they have yet done, the grounds on which this compatibility may be said to rest. To deny historicity, to correct dates by hundreds of years, to reverse judgments on which a nation has rested for centuries, to traverse views which have been the spiritual sustenance of millions, and then to say that all this is consistent with the Old Testament being regarded as a Divine revelation, is at least puzzling, and does not afford mental or moral satisfaction to many who do not dream of questioning the *bona fides* of scholars who hold the views now criticized. The extremes to which Dr. Cheyne has gone seem to many the logical outcome of the principles with which modern criticism, even of a moderate type, starts. *Facilis descensus Averno,* and we should like to be shown the solid and logical halting-place where those who refuse to go with Cheyne think that they and we can stand.

Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, commenting March 12, 1903, on a speech delivered by the then Prime Minister of Great Britain (Mr. Balfour) in connection with the Bible Society's Centenary, made the following significant remarks: "The immediate results of criticism are in a high degree disturbing. So far they have scarcely been understood by the average Christian. But the plain man who has been used to receive everything in the Bible as a veritable Word of God cannot fail to be perplexed, and deeply perplexed, when he is told that much of the Old Testament and the New is unhistorical, and when he is asked to accept the statement that God reveals Himself by myth and legend as well as by the truth, of fact. Mr. Balfour must surely know that many of the higher critics have ceased to be believers. More than twenty years ago the present writer, walking with Julius Wellhausen in the quaint streets of Greifswald, ventured to ask him whether, if his views were

accepted, the Bible could retain its place in the estimation of the common people. 'I cannot see how that is possible,' was the sad reply."

It is no mere question of how we may use the Old Testament for preaching, or how much is left for use after the critical views are accepted. But even our preaching will lack a great deal of the note of certitude. If we are to regard certain biographies as unhistorical, it will not be easy to draw lessons for conduct, and if the history is largely legendary, our deductions about God's government and providence must be essentially weakened. But the one point to be faced is the historic credibility of those parts of the Old Testament questioned by modern criticism, and the historical and religious value of the documents of the Pentateuch. Meanwhile, we ask to have clear proof of the compatibility of the modern views with the acceptance of the Old Testament as the record of a Divine revelation.

5. IS MODERN CRITICISM BASED ON A SOUND PHILOSOPHY SUCH AS CHRISTIANS CAN ACCEPT?

At the foundation of much modern thought is the philosophy known as Idealism, which, as often interpreted, involves a theory of the universe that finds no room for supernatural interpositions of any kind. The great law of the universe, including the physical, mental, and moral realms, is said to be evolution, and though this doubtless presupposes an original Creator, it does not, on the theory now before us, permit of any subsequent direct intervention of God during the process of development. This general philosophical principle applied to history has assuredly influenced, if it has not almost moulded, a great deal of modern criticism of the Old Testament. It is not urged that all who accept even the position of a moderate criticism, go the full length of the extreme evolutionary theory; but there can be no reasonable doubt that most of the criticism of the Old Testament is materially affected by an

evolutionary theory of all history which tends to minimize Divine intervention in the affairs of the people of Israel. It is certainly correct to say that the presupposition of much present-day critical reasoning is a denial of the supernatural, and especially of the predictive element in prophecy.

As to the theory of evolution regarded as a process of uninterrupted differentiation of existences, under purely natural laws, and without any Divine intervention, it will suffice to say that it is "not proven" in the sphere of natural science, while in the realms of history and literature it is palpably false. The records of history and of literature reveal from time to time the great fact and factor of personality, the reality of personal power, and this determinative element has a peculiar way of setting at naught all idealistic theories of a purely natural and uniform progress in history and letters. The literature of today is not necessarily higher than that produced in the past; the history of the last century is not in every way and always superior to that of its predecessors. Even a "naturalistic" writer like Professor Percy Gardner testifies to the fact and force of personality in the following remarkable terms:

"There is, in fact, a great force in history which is not, so far as we can judge, evolutional, and the law of which is very hard to trace—the force of personality and character." And quite apart from such instances of personality as have arisen from time to time through the centuries, there is one Personality who has not yet been accounted for by any theory of evolution—the Person of Jesus of Nazareth.

There are sufficient data in current Old Testament criticism to warrant the statement that it proceeds from presuppositions concerning the origins of history, religion, and the Bible, which, in their essence, are subversive of belief in a Divine revelation. And such being the case, we naturally look with grave suspicion on results derived from so unsound a philosophical basis.

6. CAN PURELY NATURALISTIC PREMISES BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT COMING TO PURELY NATURALISTIC CONCLUSIONS?

Kuenen and Wellhausen are admittedly accepted as masters by our leading Old Testament "higher critics" in England, Scotland, and America, and the results of their literary analysis of the Pentateuch are generally regarded as conclusive by their followers. On the basis of this literary dissection, certain conclusions are formed as to the character and growth of Old Testament religion, and, as a result, the history of the Jews is reconstructed. The Book of Deuteronomy is said to be mainly, if not entirely, a product of the reign of Josiah, the accounts of the tabernacle and worship are of exilic date; monotheism in Israel was of late date, and was the outcome of a growth from polytheism; and the present Book of Genesis reflects the thoughts of the time of its composition or compilation in or near the date of the Exile.

Now it is known that Kuenen and Wellhausen deny the supernatural element in the Old Testament. This is the "presupposition" of their entire position. Will anyone say that it does not materially affect their conclusions? And is there any safe or logical halting-ground for those who accept so many of their premises? The extreme subjectivity of Canon Cheyne ought not to be a surprise to any who accept the main principles of modern higher criticism; it is part of the logical outcome of the general position. We gladly distinguish between the extremists and the other scholars who see no incompatibility between the acceptance of many of the literary and historical principles of Kuenen and Wellhausen and a belief in the Divine source and authority of the Old Testament. But we are bound to add that the unsatisfying element in the writings of moderate men like Canon Driver and Principal George Adam Smith is that, while accepting so much of the "naturalism" of the German school, they do not give us any clear assurance of the strength of the foundation on which

they rest and ask us to rest. The tendency of their position is certainly towards a minimizing of the supernatural in the Old Testament.

Take, as one instance, the Messianic element. In spite of the universal belief of Jews and Christians in a personal Messiah, a belief derived in the first place solely from the Old Testament, and supported for Christians by the New, modern criticism will not allow much clear and undoubted prediction of Him. Insight into existing conditions is readily granted to the prophets, but they are not allowed to have had much foresight into future conditions connected with the Messiah. Yet Isaiah's glowing words remain, and demand a fair, full exegesis such as they do not get from many modern scholars. Dr. James Wells, of Glasgow, wrote in the "British Weekly" some time ago of the new criticism on this point:

"The fear of prediction in the proper sense of the term is ever before its eyes. It gladly enlarges on fore-shadowings, a moral historical growth which reaches its culmination in Christ; and anticipations of the Spirit of Christ; but its tendency is always to minimize the prophetic element in the Old Testament."

Another example of the tendency of modern criticism to minimize and explain away the supernatural element may be given from a book entitled, "The Theology and Ethics of the Hebrews," by Dr. Archibald Duff, Professor in the Yorkshire College, Bradford. This is his account of Moses at the burning bush:

"He was shepherding his sheep among the red granite mountains. . . . The man sat at dawn by the stream, and watched the fiery rocks. Yonder gleamed the level sunlight across the low growth. Each spine glistened against the rising sun. The man was a poet, one fit for inspiration. He felt that the dreams of his soul were the whisperings of his God, the place His sanctuary. He bowed and worshipped,"

(p. 6.) This, at least, is not the prima facie impression derived from the account given in Exodus.

One more illustration may be given of modern critical methods of dealing with narratives of the Old Testament which were evidently intended to be regarded as historical. In the "International Critical Commentary" on Numbers, Dr. G. B. Gray, of Mansfield College, Oxford, thus writes on what he terms "the priestly section of the book":

"For the history of the Mosaic age the whole section is valueless." "The historical impression given by (P) of the Mosaic age is altogether unhistorical, and much of the detail . . . can . . . be demonstrated to be entirely unreal, or at least untrue of the age in question." "This history is fictitious."

These statements at once set aside the history contained in more than three-quarters of the whole Book of Numbers, while as to the rest Dr. Gray's verdict is by no means reassuring, and he clearly does not possess much confidence in even the small quantity that escapes his condemnation. The brazen serpent is said to be an invention on the part of some "who had come under the higher prophetic teaching" before Hezekiah, and is meant "to controvert the popular belief" in the healing power of the serpent by ascribing it to Jehovah. As to the story of Balaam, Dr. Gray wrotes:

"It may, indeed, contain other historical features, such as the name of Balak, who may have been an actual king of Moab; but no means at present exist for distinguishing any further between the historical or legendary elements and those which are supplied by the creative faculty and the religious feeling of the writers."

What is any ordinary earnest Christian to make of all these statements? The writer of the Book of Numbers evidently composed what professes to be history, and what he meant to be read as history, and yet according to Dr. Gray all this has no historical foundation. We can only say that

the Christian Church will require very much more convincing proofs before they can accept the critical position, and it does not facilitate our acceptance of this wholesale process of invention to be told that it is due to "the creative faculty and the religious feeling of the writers."

As to the fact that so many of our British and American "higher critics" are firm believers in the Divine authority of the Old Testament, and of a Divine revelation embodied in it, we cannot but feel the force of the words of the late Dr. W. H. Green, of Princeton: "They who have themselves been thoroughly grounded in the Christian faith may, by a happy inconsistency, hold fast their old convictions, while admitting principles, methods, and conclusions that are logically at war with them. But who can be surprised if others shall with stricter logic carry what has been thus commended to them to its legitimate conclusions?"

7. CAN WE OVERLOOK THE EVIDENCE OF ARCHAEOLOGY?

It is well known that during the last sixty years a vast number of archaeological discoveries have been made in Egypt, Palestine, Babylonia, and Assyria. Many of these have shed remarkable light on the historical features of the Old Testament. A number of persons and periods have been illuminated by these discoveries and are now seen with a clearness which was before impossible.

Now it is a simple and yet striking fact that not one of these discoveries during the whole of this time has given any support to the distinctive features and principles of the higher critical position, while, on the other hand, many of them have afforded abundant confirmation of the traditional and conservative view of the Old Testament.

Let us consider a few of these discoveries. Only a little over forty years ago the conservative "Speaker's Commentary" actually had to take into consideration the critical arguments then so prevalent in favor of the late invention

of writing. This is an argument which is never heard now in critical circles. The change of attack is most striking. While forty or fifty years ago it was argued that Moses could not possibly have had sufficient learning to write the Pentateuch, now it is argued as the result of these modern discoveries that he would have been altogether behind his contemporaries if he had not been able to write. Again, the Babylonian story of the flood agrees in long sections with the account in Genesis, and it is known that the Babylonian version was in existence for ages before the dates assigned to the Genesis narrative by the critical school. Professor Sayce rightly calls this a crucial test of the critical position. The historicity of the kings mentioned in Genesis 14 was once seriously questioned by criticism, but this is impossible today, for their historical character has been proved beyond all question, and, in particular, it is now known that the Amraphel of that chapter is the Hammurabi of the Monuments and a contemporary with Abraham. The puzzling story of Sarah and Hagar is also now seen to be in exact agreement with Babylonian custom. Then again, the Egypt of Joseph and Moses is true to the smallest details of the life of the Egypt of that day and is altogether different from the very different Egypt of later ages. Sargon, who for centuries was only known from the one reference to him in Isa. 20:1, is now seen to have been one of the most important kings of Assyria. And the Aramaic language of Daniel and Ezra, which has so often been accused of lateness, is proved to be in exact accord with the Aramaic of that age, as shown by the Papyri discovered at Elephantinè in Egypt.

Now these, and others like them, are tangible proofs which can be verified by ordinary people. Hebrew philology is beyond most of us and is too subjective for any convincing argument to be based upon it, but archaeology offers an objective method of putting historical theories to the test.

Not the least important feature of the archaeological argu-

ment is that a number of leading archaeologists who were formerly in hearty agreement with the critical school, have now abandoned this view and oppose it. As Sir William Robertson Nicoll has forcibly said: "The significant fact is that the great first-hand archaeologists as a rule do not trust the higher criticism. This means a great deal more than can be put on paper to account for their doubt. It means that they are living in an atmosphere where arguments that flourish outside do not thrive."

Professor Flinders Petrie, the great Egyptologist, uttered these words not long ago: "I have come to the conclusion that there is a far more solid basis than seems to be supposed by many critics. . . . I have not the slightest doubt that contemporary documents give a truly solid foundation for the records contained in the Pentateuch. . . . The essential point is that some of these critical people support from an *a priori* basis instead of writing upon ascertained facts. We should remember that writing at the time of the Exodus was as familiar as it is now. . . . The fact is that it is hopeless for these people by means merely of verbal criticism to succeed in solving all difficulties that arise."

8. ARE THE VIEWS OF MODERN CRITICISM CONSISTENT WITH THE WITNESS OF OUR LORD TO THE OLD TESTAMENT?

The Christian Church approaches the Old Testament mainly and predominantly from the standpoint of the resurrection of Christ. We naturally inquire what our Master thought of the Old Testament, for if it comes to us with His authority, and we can discover His view of it, we ought to be satisfied.

In the days of our Lord's life on earth one pressing question was, "What think ye of the Christ?" Another was, "What is written in the Law? How readest thou?" These questions are still being raised in one form or another, and today, as of old, the two great problems—two "storm-

centers", as they have well been called—are Christ and the Bible.

The two problems really resolve themslves into one, for Christ and the Bible are inseparable. If we follow Christ, He will teach us of the Bible; and if we study our Bible, it will point us to Christ. Each is called the Word of God.

Let us, first of all, be quite clear as to our meaning of our Lord as "The Word of God." "In the beginning was the Word." A word is an oral or visible expression of an invisible thought. The thought needs the word for its expression, and the word is intended to represent the thought accurately, even if not completely. We cannot in any degree be sure of the thought unless we can be sure of the word. Our Lord as the Word, therefore, is the personal and visible expression of the invisible God. (John 14; Heb. 1:3.) We believe that He is an accurate "expression" of God, and that as the Word He reveals God and conveys God's will to us in such a way as to be inerrant and infallible. As the Incarnate Word He is infallible.

He came, among other things, to bear witness to the truth (John 18:37), and it is a necessary outcome of this purpose that He should bear infallible witness. He came to reveal God and God's will, and this implies and requires special knowledge. It demands that every assertion of His be true. The Divine knowledge did not, because it could not, undergo any change by the Incarnation. He continued to subsist in the form of God even while He existed in the form of man. (Phil. 2:6. See Dr. Gifford's "The Incarnation.")

In view of this position, we believe that, as Bishop Ellicott says ("Christus Comprobator") we have a right to make this appeal to the testimony of Christ to the Old Testament. The place it occupied in His life and ministry is sufficient warrant for referring to His use of it. It is well known that, as far as the Old Testament canon is concerned, our highest authority is that of our Lord Himself; and what is

true of the Old Testament as a whole, is surely true of these parts to which our Lord specifically referred.

Let us be clear, however, as to what we mean in making this appeal. We do not for an instant intend thereby to close all possible criticism of the Old Testament. There are numbers of questions quite untouched by anything our Lord said, and there is consequently ample scope for sober, necessary, and valuable criticism. But what we do say is, that anything in the Old Testament stated by our Lord as a fact, or implied as a fact, is, or ought to be, thereby closed for those who hold Christ to be infallible. Criticism can do anything that is not incompatible with the statements of our Lord; but where Christ has spoken, surely "the matter is closed."

What, then, is our Lord's general view of the Old Testament? There is no doubt that His Old Testament was practically, if not actually, the same as ours, and that He regarded it as of Divine authority, as the final court of appeal for all questions connected with it. The way in which He quotes it shows this. To the Lord Jesus the Old Testament was authoritative and final, because Divine.

No one can go through the Gospels without being impressed with the deep reverence of our Lord for the Old Testament, and with His constant use of it in all matters of religious thought and life. His question, "Have ye never read?" His assertion, "It is written," His testimony, "Ye search the Scriptures" (R. V), are plainly indicative of His view of the Divine authority of the Old Testament as we have it. He sets His seal to its historicity and its revelation of God. He supplements, but never supplants it. He amplifies and modifies, but never nullifies it. He fulfills, i. e. fills full, but never makes void.

This general view is confirmed by His detailed references to the Old Testament. Consider His testimonies to the persons, and to the facts of the old covenant.

There is scarcely a historical book, from Genesis to 2 Chronicles, to which our Lord does not refer; while it is perhaps significant that His testimony includes references to every book of the Pentateuch, to Isaiah, to Jonah, to Daniel, and to miracles—the very parts most called in question today.

Above all, it is surely of the deepest moment that at His temptation He should use three times as the Word of God the book about which there has, perhaps, been most controversy of all.

Again, therefore, we say that everything to which Christ can be said, on any honest interpretation, to have referred, or which He used as a fact, is thereby sanctioned and sealed by the authority of our Infallible Lord. "Dominus locutus est; causa finita est."

Nor can this position be turned by the statement that Christ simply adopted the beliefs of His day without necessarily sanctioning them as correct. Of this there is not the slightest proof, but very much to the contrary. On some of the most important subjects of His day He went directly against prevailing opinion. His teaching about God, about righteousness, about the Messiah, about tradition, about the Sabbath, about the Samaritans, about women, about divorce, about the baptism of John, were diametrically opposed to that of the time. And this opposition was deliberately grounded on the Old Testament which our Lord charged them with misinterpreting. The one and only question of difference between Him and the Jews as to the Old Testament was that of interpretation. Not a vestige of proof can be adduced that He and they differed at all in their general view of its historical character or Divine authority. If the current Jewish views were wrong, can we think our Lord would have been silent on a matter of such moment, about a book which He cites or alludes to over four hundred times, and which He made His constant topic in teaching concerning Himself? If the Jews were wrong, Jesus either knew it,

or He did not. If He knew it, why did He not correct them as in so many other and detailed instances? If He did not know it—but I will not finish.

Nor can this witness to the Old Testament be met by asserting that the limitation of our Lord's earthly life kept Him within current views of the Old Testament which need not have been true views. This statement ignores the essential force of His personal claim to be "the Word."

On more than one occasion our Lord claimed to speak from God, and that everything He said had the Divine warrant. Let us notice carefully what this involves. It is sometimes said that our Lord's knowledge was limited, and that He lived here as man, not as God. Suppose we grant this for argument's sake. Very well; as man He lived in God and on God, and He claimed that everything He said and did was from God and through God. If, then, the limitations were from God, so *also were the utterances;* and, as God's warrant was claimed for every one of these, they are therefore Divine and infallible. (John 5:19; 5:30; 7:13; 8:26; 12:49; 14:24; 17:8.) Even though we grant to the full a theory that will compel us to accept a temporary disuse or non-use of the functions of Deity in the Person of our Lord, yet the words actually uttered as man are claimed to be from God, and therefore we hold them to be infallible. We rest, therefore, upon our Lord's personal claim to say all and do all by the Father, from the Father, for the Father.

There is, of course, no question of partial knowledge after the resurrection, when our Lord was manifestly free from all limitations of earthly conditions. Yet it was after His resurrection also that He set His seal to the Old Testament. (Luke 24:44.)

We conclude that our Lord's positive statements on the subject of the Old Testament are not to be rejected without charging Him with error. If, on these points, on which we can test and verify Him, we find that He is not reliable,

what real comfort can we have in accepting His higher teaching, where verification is impossible? We believe we are on absolutely safe ground when we say that what the Old Testament was to our Lord, it must be and shall be to us.

CONCLUSION

We ask a careful consideration of these eight inquiries. Taken separately, they carry weight, but taken together they have a cumulative effect, and should be seriously pondered by all who are seeking to know the truth on this momentous subject.

We may be perfectly sure that no criticism of the Old Testament will ever be accepted by the Christian Church as a whole, which does not fully satisfy the following conditions:

1. It must admit in all its assumptions, and take fully into consideration, the supernatural element which differentiates the Bible from all other books.
2. It must be in keeping with the enlightened spiritual experience of the saints of God in all ages, and make an effectual appeal to the piety and spiritual perception of those who know by personal experience the power of the Holy Ghost.
3. It must be historically in line with the general tradition of Jewish history and the unique position of the Hebrew nation through the centuries.
4. It must be in unison with that apostolic conception of the authority and inspiration of the Old Testament, which is so manifest in the New Testament.
5. Above all, it must be in accordance with the universal belief of the Christian Church in our Lord's infallibility as a Teacher, and as "the Word made flesh."

If and when modern higher criticism can satisfy these requirements, it will not merely be accepted, but will command the universal, loyal, and even enthusiastic adhesion of all Christians. Until then, we wait, and also maintain our position that "the old is better."

CHAPTER VIII

THE TABERNACLE IN THE WILDERNESS: DID IT EXIST?

A QUESTION INVOLVING THE TRUTH OR FALSITY OF THE ENTIRE HIGHER-CRITIC THEORY

BY DAVID HEAGLE, PH. D., D. D.,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AND ETHICS, EWING COLLEGE; TRANSLATOR "BREMEN LECTURES"; AUTHOR OF "MORAL EDUCATION," "THAT BLESSED HOPE," ETC.

INTRODUCTORY

The question as to whether or not the old Mosaic Tabernacle ever existed is one of far greater consequence than most people imagine. It is so, particularly because of the very intimate connection existing between it and the truth or falsity of the higher-critic theory in general. If that theory is all that the critics claim for it, then of course the Tabernacle had no existence; and this is the view held by at least most of the critics. But if, on the other hand, the old Mosaic Tabernacle did really exist, and the story of it as given in the Bible is not, as the critics assert, merely a fiction, then the higher-critic scheme cannot be true.

The question, therefore, to be discussed in the following pages, viz., whether the Mosaic Tabernacle really did or did not exist, is certainly one of great and wide-reaching significance; which significance will become more and more apparent as the discussion goes forward. With this brief intro-

duction we take up the subject; merely premising further, that this article was originally prepared as a booklet, in which shape it contained a considerable amount of matter not appearing here.

THE DISCUSSION

One peculiarity of the higher criticism is what may be called its unbounded audacity in attacking and attempting to destroy many of the most solidly established facts of the Bible. No matter with what amount of evidence any particular Scripture fact may be capable of demonstration, if it happens to oppose any of the more fundamental notions of the critical hypothesis, away it must go as unworthy of acceptance by so-called "science," or at all events, the entire array of critical doubts and imaginings is brought to bear, in order to cast suspicion upon it, or to get rid of it in some way.

I. THE BIBLE SIDE OF THE QUESTION

A striking illustration of such procedure is furnished by the peculiar treatment accorded by the critics to that old religious structure which, being built by Moses near Mt. Sinai, is usually named the Tabernacle, or the Tabernacle in the Wilderness. That such a structure not only existed, but was for some five hundred years a very conspicuous object in ancient Israelitish history, is a fact to which the Bible itself lends no small amount of evidence. For example, there are found in the book of Exodus alone some thirteen chapters devoted to a minute description of the plan and construction of that building. Then, as explanatory of the Tabernacle's services, its dedication, means of transportation, the work of the priests and Levites to some extent, and various other matters connected with the structure, the entire book of Leviticus with some ten chapters in Numbers may be cited. Besides, scattered all through both the Old and New Testaments there are many allusions and notices—some of them merely incidental, but others more historical in nature—all of which go toward establishing the Tabernacle's historicity. And finally—

which is perhaps the most convincing testimony of all—we have given us in the New Testament one whole book, the Epistle to the Hebrews, which concerns, especially explaining from a Christian point of view, the typology and religious significance of that old building.

II. THE HIGHER-CRITIC VIEW

With so much evidence, therefore, to be adduced, even from the Scriptures, in support of the Tabernacle's historicity, one would think that it requires at least some literary bravery, not to say presumptuous audacity, for any individual or class of men to assail, with the expectation of overthrowing, a fact so solidly established as would seem to be that of the Tabernacle's real existence. Nevertheless, difficult as such task may appear, the critics have not hesitated most vigorously to undertake it. According to their notion the whole story of the Tabernacle, as recorded in the Bible, is simply a fiction, or, more properly speaking, a literary forgery—a concoction gotten up perhaps by some of those priestly scribes who returned with Ezra from the Babylonian exile; their special purpose in devising such a story being to help in the introduction of a new temple ritual at Jerusalem, or perhaps it was also to glorify the distant past in the history of the Israelites.*

III. THE QUESTION MORE FULLY STATED

Thus we have presented to us two widely different and opposing views respecting the Tabernacle's existence. One of them, which is the view of at least most higher critics, is that this old structure never existed at all; while, on the other hand, the orthodox and Biblical conception is that not only in the days of Moses but long afterwards this fabric had a most interesting and important history. Which, then, of these two so widely different doctrines are we pleased to accept?

*As explained by Nödelke, another purpose of this forgery was "to give pre-existence to the temple and to the unity of worship." But this is virtually included in the two purposes above named.

IV. IMPORTANCE OF THIS DISCUSSION

1. Whichever one is accepted by us, certain it is that an earnest discussion, such as we hope to effect, of the question above stated, is a matter of no little consequence. Such a discussion is important, first of all, because of the light which it will throw upon all the history of God's first chosen people—the Israelites. It will at least tell us something about the kind of civilization this ancient people must have had; and more particularly will it tell us whether that civilization was, as the higher critics represent, one low down on the scale, or whether these Israelites had already made a good degree of progress in all the arts, disciplines, and branches of knowledge which usually belong to a moderately high state of civilization. Surely, then, there is at least some benefit to be derived from the study before us.

2. But another advantage which will come from this same study is that it will help us to a solution of a somewhat curious, but yet important, historical problem; viz., whether as a matter of history the Temple preceded the Tabernacle, as the higher critics claim, and, therefore, that the Tabernacle must be regarded as only "a diminutive copy" of the Temple; or vice versa, whether, as is taught by the Bible, the Tabernacle went first, and hence that the Temple was in its construction patterned after the Tabernacle. To be sure, at first sight this does not appear to be a very important question; yet when the historical, literary and other connections involved in it are considered, it does after all become a question of no little significance.

3. But the most determinative and therefore the most significant interest we have in a discussion of the question as proposed, is the bearing which it has upon the truth or falsity of the higher criticism. As is known to persons conversant with that peculiar method of Bible study, one of its main contentions is that the whole Levitical or ceremonial law—

that is, the law of worship as recorded especially in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers—did not originate, or at all events did not make its appearance, until somewhere near the close of the Babylonian exile, or about the time when Ezra first appears in Jewish history. By thus removing all that part of the Pentateuch down the centuries, from the time of Moses to the time of Ezra, the critics are able not only to deny the Mosaic authorship of this Pentateuchal literature, but also to construct a scheme of their own by which all the separate "documents" into which they are accustomed to divide the Pentateuch can be put together in a kind of whole; each particular document being singled out and designated according to its date, authorship, and other peculiarities, such as the critics suppose belong to it. Moreover, in this way the Pentateuch is all torn to pieces, and instead of its being really a connected, organic whole, such as the orthodox world has always conceived it to be, it is by this peculiar higher-critic method transformed into a mere patch-work, a disjointed affair, having no more divine authority or inspiration connected with it than any other piece of human literature that has come into being through the law of evolution.

Such, however, is exactly what the critics would make of the Pentateuch, and indeed of much else in the Bible, if they could have their way.

But now suppose that after all the old Mosaic Tabernacle did really exist, what effect would that have upon the success of the critical hypothesis? It would absolutely frustrate all attempts to carry this hypothesis successfully through. Such would necessarily be the result, because, first of all, if that portion of the Pentateuch which contains the ceremonial or Levitical law is transferred down to Ezra's time, the old Tabernacle, for the services of which this law was designed, must necessarily come with it. But then, in the second place, a really existing Tabernacle so far down the centuries, or long after the Temple at Jerusalem had been built and was regarded

by the Jews as their great central place of worship, would have been not only an architectural curiosity, but an anachronism such as even the critical imagination could scarcely be accused either of devising or accepting.

The only way, therefore, open for the critics, if they are still to hold fast their theory, is for them to do precisely what they have undertaken; namely, to blot out or destroy the Tabernacle as a real existence, and then to reconstruct the entire story of it, as given in the Bible, in the form of a fiction. This they have really attempted.

But by so doing the critics must, after all, confess that the foundation upon which they build is very insecure, because it is simply an assumption. If, therefore, in opposition to such assumption, this article shall be able to demonstrate that the old Mosaic Tabernacle actually existed, then the underpinning of the critical hypothesis is at once removed, and the entire edifice with all of its many stories must collapse. And if all this is true, then it is not too much to say, as is affirmed in the sub-title of this article, that the whole truth or falsity of the critical scheme depends upon what may be proven true respecting the Tabernacle's non-existence or existence.

And thus, moreover, is made to appear the exceeding importance of the discussion we have undertaken.

V. QUOTATIONS FROM THE HIGHER CRITICS

But what do the higher critics themselves say with regard to this matter of the Tabernacle's real existence? To quote from only a few of them, Wellhausen, e. g., who is the great coryphæus of the higher-critic doctrine, writes as follows: "The Temple, which in reality was not built until Solomon's time, is by this document [the so-called Priestly Code] regarded as so indispensable, even for the troubled days of the wilderness before the settlement, that it is made portable, and in the form of a tabernacle set up in the very beginning of things. For the truth is that the Tabernacle is a copy, not

the prototype, of the temple at Jerusalem" (Proleg., Eng. trans., p. 37). So also Graf, who preceded Wellhausen in higher-critic work, affirms that the Tabernacle is only "a diminutive copy of the Temple," and that "all that is said about this structure in the middle books of the Pentateuch is merely post-exilic accretion." Once more, to hear from a more recent authority, Dr. A. R. S. Kennedy, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible,* has these words: "The attitude of modern Old Testament scholarship to the priestly legislation as now formulated in the Pentateuch, and in particular to those sections of it which deal with the sanctuary and its worship, is opposed to the historicity of P's [that is, the old Mosaic] Tabernacle." The same or a similar representation is given by Benzinger in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica;* and in fact this is, and must necessarily be, the attitude of all consistent higher critics toward the matter under consideration. For it would never do for the adherents of the critic theory to admit that away back in the old Mosaic times the Tabernacle, with all its elaborate ritual, and with the lofty moral and spiritual ideas embodied in it, could have existed; because that would be equivalent to admitting the falsity of their own doctrine. Accordingly with one voice the critics all, or nearly all, stoutly proclaim that no historicity whatever must be allowed to Moses' Tabernacle.

VI. CERTAIN GREAT PRESUMPTIONS

To come then to the actual discussion of our subject, it might be said, in the first place, that there are certain great presumptions which lie in the way of our accepting the higher-critic theory as true.

1. One of these presumptions is, that this whole critic hypothesis goes on the assumption that what the Bible tells us regarding the real existence of the Tabernacle is not true, or, in other words, that in a large part of its teachings the Bible speaks falsely. Can we believe that? Most assuredly

not, so long as we have any real appreciation of the lofty system of moral truth which is taught in this wonderful book—a book which, more than any other ever produced, has taught the entire world common honesty, whether in literary work or other acts. Therefore we say, regarding this whole matter of the Bible's speaking falsely, *Judaeus Apella credat, non ego!* Let the higher critics believe that if they will, but surely not we!

Robert Burns has a poem, in which he says of lying in general:

> "Some books are lies frae end to end,
> And some great lies were never penned;
> E'en ministers, they hae been kenned,
> In holy rapture,
> A rousing whid at times to vend,
> An' nail it wi' Scripture."

Surely, the higher critics would not undertake to reduce our Christian Scriptures to the level of a book that has in it no truth from beginning to end; and yet it must be confessed that one serious tendency of their theory is greatly to lessen the general credibility of this sacred volume.

2. But another presumption lying against the truthfulness of this higher criticism is, that it makes all the civilized ages from Ezra down to the present time to be so utterly lacking both in historic knowledge and literary sagacity, that, excepting a few higher critics, no one ever supposed the whole world was being deceived by this untrue story of the Tabernacle's real existence; when, if the facts were told, all these numerous ages have not only been themselves deceived, but have been also instrumental, one after another, in propagating that same old falsehood down the centuries! Again we say: *Judaeus Apella credat, non ego!* The higher-critic pretensions to having a greater wisdom and knowledge than is possessed by all the rest of the world, are very well known; but

this illustration of that peculiarity seems to us rather to cap the climax.

3. And here, if we choose to go farther, it might be shown that, if this peculiar doctrine is true, then the Savior and all of his Apostles were mistaken. For certainly Christ (see Matt. 12:3, 4) and perhaps all the Apostles without exception, did believe in the Tabernacle as a real existence; and one of the Apostles, or at least an apostolic writer, went so far, in the Book of Hebrews, as to compose what may be termed an extensive and inspired commentary on that sacred structure—on its apartments, furniture, priesthood and services; bringing out particularly, from a Christian point of view, the rich typical significance of all those matters. Now that all these inspired men and the Savior Himself should either have been themselves deceived or should try to deceive others with regard to an important matter of Old Testament history is surely incredible.

VII. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

1. Just here, however, we desire to introduce some considerations of a different nature. There exists, even outside of the Bible, a small amount of evidence in support of the Tabernacle's existence, and although we have already alluded to a part of this testimony, under the head of favoring presumptions, yet it will bear repetition or rather a fuller consideration. Now, as we conceive of this evidence, it consists, in the first place, of various notices or even of full descriptions of the Tabernacle as a real existence, which are found in very ancient writings, some of these writings being quite different from our Christian Scriptures. To be sure, a large part of this literature is copied in one way and another from the Bible, and none of it dates anything like so far back in time as do at least the earlier books of the Old Testament; and yet, as we shall see, some of it is very old, sufficiently so to give it a kind of confirmatory force in support of what the Bible has to say concerning the matter in hand.

The first testimony, then, of this sort to which we allude, is a full description of the Tabernacle in all its parts, services, priesthood and history, very nearly the same as that which is given in our modern Bibles, which can be found in the earliest translation ever made of the Old Testament—that is, the Septuagint. This translation appeared some two or three centuries before the time of Christ, and therefore it ought to be pretty good evidence of at least what its contemporaries, or those far-off times, held to be true with regard to the matter under consideration. Then another testimony of like character comes from the Greek Apocrypha to the Old Testament, a work which appeared, or at least most of it, before the time of Christ; in which production there are found various allusions to the Tabernacle, and all of them to it as a real existence; as, e. g., in Jud. 9:8; Wis. of Sol. 9:8; Eccl. 24:10, 15; and 2 Mac. 2:5. Moreover, in his *Antiquities,* Josephus, who wrote toward the end of the first century, gives another full description of that old structure in its every part, including also something of its history. (See Antiq., Bk. III., Chs. VI. to XII.; also Bk. V., Ch. I., Sec. 19; Ch. II., Sec. 9; Ch. X., Sec. 2; Bk. VIII., Ch. IV., Sec. 1.) And finally, in that vast collection of ancient Jewish traditions, comments, laws, speculations, etc., which goes under the name of the Talmud, there are not infrequent references made to this same old structure; and one of the treatises (part of the Bereitha)* in that collection is devoted exclusively to a consideration of this building.

With so much literature, therefore, of one kind and another, all telling us something about the Tabernacle, and all or at least most of it going back for its origin to very near the time when at least the last part of the Old Testament was

*The Bereitha (or Baraitha) is an apocryphal part of the Talmud; but it is very old, and embodies about the same quality of tradition in general as does the compilation made by Jehudah ha-Nasi, which is usually considered the genuine Mishna, or basis of the Talmud.

written, we have in these various sources, considered as a whole, if not an independent or direct testimony to the Tabernacle's existence, certainly something that points clearly in that direction. Or, in other words, inasmuch as these old writings, containing the various notices and descriptions which we have mentioned, existed away back so near to Old Testament times, these must have been acquainted with the best traditions of their day regarding what is taught in that part of our Bible; and, therefore, they must have known more about the truth of things as connected with the Tabernacle and its real existence than any authorities existing in these late times of ours possibly could. Or, at all events, they knew more about those matters than any of the mere guesswork speculations of modern higher critics possibly can, or are in a condition to know.*

2. But there is another kind of evidence, of this external nature, which is more direct and independent, and therefore more significant with regard to the Tabernacle's existence. That evidence is what may be called the archæological contribution to our argument. Part of it will be given later;† but here we will simply call attention, first, to the fact that in all the region of Mt. Sinai there are to be seen at least some evidences of the possible presence there, even as is recorded

*The value of this evidence is of course only that which belongs to tradition; still it should be remembered that this tradition is a written one, dating away back to near the times of the Old Testament. Moreover, it could be shown that this same kind of written tradition reaches back through the later books of the Old Testament, at least in a negative way, even to the time of Ezra; who surely ought to know whether, as the critics say, the story of the Tabernacle as a fact of history was invented in his own day and generation. But inasmuch as Ezra does not tell us anything about that matter, it stands to reason, that as has since been reported by this long line of tradition, most of it being of a positive nature, no such invention ever took place, but that this story is simply a narrative of actual fact. At all events, as said in the text, it is far more likely that this old and long-continued tradition is correct in what it asserts, than is any of the denials of the higher critics.

†See pp. 183-85.

in the Bible, of the Israelites, at the time when they built the Tabernacle.* Moreover, there have recently been made some discoveries in the Holy Land connected with the different places where the Bible locates the Tabernacle during the long period of its history in that country, which, to say the least, are not contradictory, but rather confirmatory of Biblical statements. One such discovery, as we will call it, is connected with a fuller exploration recently made of that old site where for some 365 years, according to Jewish tradition, the old Mosaic Tabernacle stood, and where it underwent the most interesting of its experiences in the Holy Land. That site was, as is well known, the little city of Shiloh, located near the main thoroughfare leading up from Bethel to Shechem. In the year 1873 the English Palestine Exploration Fund, through some of its agents, made a thorough examination of this old site, and among other of its very interesting ruins was found a place which Colonel Charles Wilson thinks is the *very spot* where, once and for so long a time, the Tabernacle stood. That particular place is at the north of a rather low "tell," or mound, upon which the ruins are located; and, to copy from Colonel Wilson's description, this tell "slopes down to a broad shoulder, across which a sort of local court, 77 feet wide and 412 feet long, has been cut out. The rock is in places scarped to a height of five feet, and along the sides are several excavations and a few small cisterns." This is the locality where, as Colonel Wilson thinks, the Mosaic Tabernacle once really stood; and as confirmatory of his conclusion he farther says that this spot is the only one connected with the ruins which is large enough to receive a building of the dimensions of the Tabernacle. Therefore his judgment is that it is "not improbable" that this place was originally "prepared" as a site for that structure.

*See Page 187.

Now whether the general judgment of men either at present or in the future will coincide with Colonel Wilson as to the matter in hand we do not know; but we will simply repeat Colonel Wilson's words, and say that it is *not improbable* that this site, as indicated, is a real discovery as to the place where the old Tabernacle once stood. We need not dwell longer here on the matter, but will only observe that if the very ruins of the old Tabernacle, so far as its site is concerned, can still be seen, that surely ought to be pretty good evidence that this building once existed.

VIII. POSITIVE BIBLICAL EVIDENCES

But to come now to the more positive and conclusive evidences regarding the matter under consideration, we may observe that these consist particularly of various historical notices scattered throughout the Old Testament; and so numerous and clear in their testimony are these notices that they would seem to prove, beyond all possibility of doubt, that the old Mosaic Tabernacle really existed.* However, the critics claim here that it is only the earlier historical books of the Old Testament that can be legitimately used for proving a matter so far in the past as was this structure.

1. TESTIMONY OF FIRST KINGS

Complying then with that requirement, at least in part, we begin our investigation with the First Book of Kings. This is a piece of literature against the antiquity and general credibility of which the critics can raise no valid objection; hence it should be considered particularly good evidence. Moreover, it might be said of this book, that having probably been constructed out of early court-records as they were kept

*According to Bishop Hervey, in his Lectures on Chronicles (p. 171), mention is made of the Tabernacle some eighteen times in the historical books following the Pentateuch—that is, in Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, and 1 and 2 Chronicles; and in the Pentateuch itself, which the higher critics have by no means proven to be unhistorical, that structure is mentioned over eighty times.

by the different kings of Judah and Israel, those original documents, or at least some of them, take us away back to the very times of Solomon and David, or to the period when, as we shall soon see, the Mosaic Tabernacle was still standing at Gibeon. This was also, it may be observed, the general period during which the Tabernacle, having been taken down, was removed from Gibeon and stored away in Solomon's temple at Jerusalem; and it is to the account of this transference that our attention is now, first of all, directed. In 1 Kings, Chap. 8, v. 4, we read: "And they brought up the ark of Jehovah, and the tent of meeting, and all the holy vessels that were in the tent; even these did the priests and Levites bring up." A mere cursory reading of these words gives one the impression that the "tent of meeting," which was brought up from somewhere by the priests and Levites, was nothing else than the old Mosaic Tabernacle; and as to the place from which it was brought, that is not told us in the Scriptures; but a comparison of texts (see 2 Chron. 1:3; 1 Kings, 3:1, 4) would seem to indicate that the Tabernacle was first transported from Gibeon to Mt. Zion, where the ark of the covenant was at this time, and then afterwards it was, with other sacred matters, carried up to Mt. Moriah, where it was put away in the temple.

All this seems to be sufficiently clear; only now the question arises whether, after all, this was really the old Mosaic structure or some other tent, as, e. g., the one built by David in Jerusalem, and which seems, at this time, to have been still in existence.* Most of the critics, including even Wellhausen, are agreed that the words, "tent of meeting" *(ohel moed),* as used in this and various other texts of Scripture, do really signify the old Mosaic structure; and one reason for their so holding is that those words form a kind of technical expression by which that old structure was commonly,

*See 2 Sam. 6:17 and 7:2; 1 Chron. 15:1 and 16:1. Cf. 1 Kings 1:29.

or at least often, denoted in the Bible.* Only one other term is used as frequently as this is to indicate that structure; this other term being, in Hebrew, *mishkan,* which is usually translated, in our English versions, "tabernacle," and means "dwelling-place." Now if this rendering of those words is correct, we would seem to have already reached the goal of our endeavor. That is to say, we have actually found the Tabernacle in existence. It existed, as an undeniable reality in the times of David and Solomon, or at least in those of Solomon; and a positive proof of that matter are these words we have just quoted from 1 Kings 8:4.

But the higher critics, or especially Wellhausen, are not so easily to be caught with an admission as to an interpretation of words; for even though Wellhausen does concede that the words "tent of meeting" signify as we have stated; nevertheless he undertakes to get rid of their real force by asserting that in this passage they are an interpolation, or that they do not belong to the original Hebrew text. However, neither he nor any other higher critic has ever yet been able to give any textual authority for such an assertion; they only try to argue the matter from internal evidence. But internal evidence alone, and especially such slim evidence of that kind as the critics have been able to adduce in this connection, is insufficient to establish the end desired. Besides, those words, "tent of meeting," are certainly found in our present Hebrew text, as also in the Septuagint version; both of which items being so, it is not at all likely that Wellhausen's *ipse dixit* will have the effect of changing them. Such being the case, we may conclude that the structure

*The words *ohel moed* seem to have been used first to designate the smaller tent (see p. 37 with footnote) which Moses used as a place of communion between Jehovah and his people; hence it was called the "tent of meeting." But afterwards, when the regular tabernacle became such a place, the words were applied also to that structure.

which was carried by the priests and Levites up to Mt. Moriah and stored away in the temple, was really the old Mosaic Tabernacle.

We quote only one other passage from this First Book of Kings. It is a part of the account of Solomon's going to Gibeon, and of his offering sacrifice there. The words are found in v. 4, Chap. 3, and read as follows: "And the king went to Gibeon, to sacrifice there; for that was the great high place." Then in the second verse of this same chapter the king's conduct in thus going to Gibeon is farther explained by the statement that the people sacrificed in the high places, because "there was no house built for the name of Jehovah until those days." The "days" here indicated are, as is explained by the preceding verse, those in which "Solomon made an end of building his own house and the house of Jehovah;" and the entire passage then would signify that at least one reason why Solomon offered sacrifice in Gibeon was because this was the customary way among the people. They offered sacrifices in the high places before the temple at Jerusalem was built, but not ordinarily, or legitimately, afterwards. Then there is another reason indicated why Solomon went particularly to Gibeon—because this was the "*great* high place." Why it was so called, must have been because of some special fact or circumstance connected with it; and among the explanations given none appears so natural or to accord so well with other teachings of Scripture as the suggestion that this distinction was applied to Gibeon because the old Mosaic Tabernacle, with the brazen altar, was still there. That would certainly be a sufficient reason for accrediting peculiar eminence to this one of all the many high places which at that time seem to have existed in the Holy Land. Accordingly, Solomon went over to Gibeon, and offered sacrifice there; and then we read that, in the night following this devotional act, the king had a dream in which Jehovah appeared unto him and made to him very extraor-

dinary promises. Now this epiphany of Jehovah at Gibeon is really another reason for one's believing that the Tabernacle was located at this place. For it is not to be supposed that any Jewish author, writing after the temple was built (when this account of Solomon's dream was written), would allow it to be said that the great and idolatry-hating God of the Israelites had made a gracious and extraordinary revelation of himself at any of the common high places in the Holy Land, half-heathenish and largely devoted to the service of idols, as these places generally were.

But if it must be admitted that the Tabernacle was really located at Gibeon, then all becomes clear, both why Solomon went there to offer sacrifice, and why Jehovah made at this place a gracious revelation of himself; also why this, of all the high places in the Holy Land, was called emphatically *"great."* Then, moreover, it might be said that we have surely demonstrated the existence of the Tabernacle, not only as taught by this passage from First Kings, but also by the other one which we have noticed.

2. TESTIMONY OF CHRONICLES

But now turning over to the two books of Chronicles, we find here quite a number of passages which teach in the clearest and most positive manner that the Tabernacle existed at Gibeon not only in the time of Solomon, but also before. These two books of Chronicles, it should be remembered, are really a kind of commentary, or an extension made, upon Samuel and Kings. Such is the opinion of many competent scholars; and one reason for their so holding, is that very evidently the books of Samuel and Kings were among the principal sources from which the author of Chronicles drew his information; although it must be acknowledged also that he used still other sources besides those named. Writing then at a somewhat distant date, say one or two hundred years from the time of the final composition, or redaction, of

Kings and Samuel,* and doubtless having at his command a considerable amount of tradition, besides his written sources, the Chronicler must have been in very good condition to write what may be considered a kind of interpretive commentary upon not only the books of Samuel, but also upon the First Book of Kings, two passages from which we have just noticed. If that was so, and the two books of Chronicles are to be understood then as giving us some additional information as to what is found in Kings, then the historical notices in First Kings which we have examined become as it were illuminated and made stronger and more positive in their nature than when considered alone. For instance, in First Kings we were told that Solomon went to Gibeon and offered sacrifice there, because "that was the great high place;" but now in 1 Chron. 1:3 we have it all explained, both how Gibeon came to be so called, and what was Solomon's special reason for going there to offer sacrifice. It was, as is taught very plainly here in Chornicles, because *"the tent of meeting of God which Moses the servant of Jehovah had made in the wilderness"* was at that time in Gibeon. Thus the rather uncertain mention of matters at Gibeon which is given in First Kings is made clear and positive by what is said in Chronicles. So also in 1 Chron. 21:29, which is a part of the account given of David's offering sacrifice on the threshing-floor of Ornan, we have again stronger language used than is found in Kings, telling us of the existence of the old Mosaic Tabernacle. For in explaining David's conduct the Chronicler says as follows: "For the *tabernacle of Jehovah*

*It is claimed by the critics that all the historical books of the Old Testament underwent a revision during the exile; and according to the best authorities, Chronicles was composed shortly after the Persian rule, or about 330 B. C. Selecting, then, about the middle of the exilic period (586 to 444 B. C.) as the date for the final revision of Kings and Samuel, this would make the composition of Chronicles fall near 200 years after that revision. But of course Samuel and Kings were originally composed, or compiled, at a much earlier date; the former appearing probably about 900, and the latter about 600 B. C.

which Moses made in the wilderness and the altar of burnt offering were at that time in the high place at Gibeon." Whatever of uncertainty, therefore, or lack of positive indication, may exist as connected with the passages we have quoted from Kings, there is no such uncertainty or lack of positiveness here in Chronicles. On the contrary, these two books, which give us quite an amount of information respecting the Tabernacle, are always, or at least generally, very clear and positive; and on this account, it might be added, the statements made in Chronicles have sometimes been taken as a kind of guide to the study of the Tabernacle history in general.

But here again the critics make their appearance, and are "all up in arms" against any use to be made of these two books of Chronicles for determining a matter of ancient history. Of all the untrustworthy historical literature to be found in the Old Testament there is nothing quite so bad, so the critics tell us, as is in general Chronicles; and Wellhausen goes so far as to say that one special purpose served by these two books is that they show how an author may use his original sources with such freedom as to make them say about what he pleases, or anything according to his own ideas. (See Proleg., Eng. trans., p. 49.) So also Graf, DeWette, and others, have very energetically attacked the credibility of these two books. But over against all that is said by the critics as to the Chronicler's lack of veracity and his violent dealing with his sources, we will simply, or first, put the testimony of one of the higher critics themselves. It is what Dillman, who in point of learning and reliability is acknowledged to be among the very foremost of all the critics, says with regard to this very matter in hand: "It is now recognized," affirms that eminent critic, "that the Chronicler has worked according to sources, and there can be no talk, with regard to him, of fabrications or misrepresentations of the history." So also Dr. Orr observes that there is no reason for doubting "the perfect good faith" of the author of

Chronicles; and Prof. James Robertson, of Glasgow University, farther adds that all such matters as the critics have urged against the Chronicler's veracity or misuse and even invention of sources, are "superficial and unjust;" and that "there is no reason to doubt the honesty of the author in the use of such materials as he has command of, nor is there any to question the existence of the writings to which he refers."

We take it, therefore, that these two books of Chronicles embody not only the best historical knowledge, but also the best traditions still in existence at their date; and such being the case, it is clearly incontrovertible that, as is so unmistakably taught in these books, the old Mosaic Tabernacle must have existed. And so long as the critics are unable to impeach the testimony of these books, which would seem to be impossible, that testimony must stand.*

3. TESTIMONY OF SAMUEL

Now, however, let us give attention to the books of Samuel. Here is certainly another piece of literature against the general credibility of which the critics can have but little to say. And what do these books tell us respecting the Taber-

*It is claimed by the critics, and especially by Wellhausen, that during the exile the Jewish notions respecting the past of their national and tribal history underwent a radical change, so much so that nearly all the religious features of that history were conceived of as having been very different from what they really were. Or in other words, the Jewish writers of the exilic period were, so the critics tell us, accustomed to project religious and priestly matters belonging to their history in a much later period away back to the earliest times. Consequently the general ideas of the temple and of the temple service were thus projected back even to the days of Moses; and in this way, it is explained, the notion of a Mosaic Tabernacle with an elaborate ritualistic service came into being. But really there is no evidence in all the Old Testament writings, or at all events no evidence that the Jews knew anything about, that such a change ever took place. Hence the critics are decidedly wrong when they represent that the author of Chronicles was only influenced by the spirit of his age when he undertook to misrepresent, as it is claimed he did, numerous matters connected with the past history of this people. The truth is that the Chronicler was either a base falsifier, or what he tells us in his history must be received as genuine facts.

nacle's history? Very much, indeed; far more than we shall have space here fully to examine. In the first place, these books tell us that during at least part of the times which they in general describe, the Mosaic Tabernacle was located at Shiloh, up in the Ephraimite district. Then next we learn that at least one of the great festivals connected with the Tabernacle services—the "yearly sacrifice" it is called—was still being observed. Also we learn that this is the place where Samuel's parents, Elkanah and Hannah, went up every year, in order to take part in that sacrifice. Moreover, it was in the sanctuary at Shiloh, or in some one of its apartments, that Samuel slept at the time when he had those extraordinary revelations of Jehovah talking with him, and where also he came into such intimate and important relations with the aged Eli and his house.

And among still other items reported in those books there is one that invites our special attention. In 1 Sam., Chap. 2, v. 22, mention is made of certain "women that did service at the door of the tent meeting." And it was with these women, as we farther learn, that Eli's two sons, Hophni and Phinehas, committed at least a part of their wickedness, for which they were so severely condemned, and afterward punished by Jehovah. Now whatever else this passage may signify, it certainly intends to teach, by its use of the words "tent of meeting," that in the time of Samuel the old Mosaic Tabernacle was in existence at Shiloh. For, as we have already seen, those words, "tent of meeting," formed a characteristic expression by which in Old Testament times the Tabernacle was, quite often at least, designated and known. This much, as we have already noticed, even Wellhausen is willing to admit.

However, the critics raise here two objections. One of them is that the sanctuary at Shiloh was not really a tent or tabernacle, but rather a solid structure, built perhaps out of stone, wood, or some other material; and the special reason

given by the critics for this view is that, in Samuel's account of the structure at Shiloh, there are "posts," "doors," and some other matters usually indicative of a solid structure mentioned. But this difficulty can be very easily explained from a statement made in the Jewish Mishna,* which is that the lower part of the sanctuary at Shiloh "was of stone," but that above this there was a tent. Or a more decisive answer to this objection is that in various Scriptures (such as 2 Sam. 7:6; Psa. 78:60; 1 Kings 8:4; Josh. 18:1, and still others) the structure under consideration is positively called "a tent" and "a tabernacle."

Then the other objection raised by the critics is that these words, "tent of meeting," as found in 1 Sam. 2:22, are an interpolation, or that the whole passage containing those words is spurious. The reason which they give for such an assertion is that this passage is not found in the Septuagint. But in reply to such objection it may be said, first, that this is not the only passage in the Bible in which mention is made of these women "at the door of the tent of meeting." In Ex. 38:8, like mention is made; and, as Dr. Orr has observed, it is inconceivable even on the supposition, which he does not accept, of a post-exilic origin of the last indicated passage, that just this one mention of the matter alluded to should occur, unless there was behind this matter some old and well-established tradition; or, in other words, the genuineness of the text in Exodus argues for the genuineness of the text in Samuel. Besides, as Dr. Orr has again suggested, there may have been some special reason of delicacy or of regard for the good moral reputation of the Israelites, on the account of which the makers of the Septuagint version threw out this item respecting the wickedness of Hophni and Phinehas as connected with these women. Then, moreover, as an offset to the Septuagint's authority—which, owing to the known

*See Conder's "Tent Work in Palestine," Vol. 2, p. 84.

faultiness of its present text and its general inexactness as a translation, is surely not great—it can be urged that the entire clause containing the words "tent of meeting" is found alike in the old Syriac or Peshito version, in the Vulgate, and in the only extant Targum (that of Jonathan Ben Uzziel) on this particular passage; all of which very ancient authorities* render it as certain as anything of a textual nature could well be made, that the old original text in 1 Sam. 2:22 was exactly as it is now in our present-day Hebrew Bible.

And, finally, as perhaps the crowning feature of this array of evidence for the genuineness of the text under consideration, it can be affirmed that, for English readers at least, there exists one authority, easy to be consulted, which would seem to put beyond all reasonable doubt the genuineness of this text. That authority is our Revised English Version of the Scriptures—a literary work that in point of scholarship and general reliability stands perhaps second to none produced in recent years. And now, if anybody will take the trouble to consult this Revised Version, he will see that this entire disputed passage is retained, or that the many eminent scholars, both English and American, who wrought on this translation are agreed that the words, "tent of meeting," or *ohel moed,* as in Hebrew, are genuine, and properly belong to this passage.

Such being the case, the critics are put in a bad plight; and anyway it does not argue much to the credit of their hypothesis when, in order to carry it through, it becomes necessary so often to make the claim of interpolation. Of course, anyone can make what he pleases of any passage of Scripture, provided he only has the privilege of doctoring it

*The Targum on Samuel, which is attributed to Jonathan Ben Uzziel, is commonly believed to have been produced some time during the first century; the Peshito version of the Scriptures is thought to have been made somewhat later, probably in the second century; while the Latin Vulgate, by Jerome, was completed between the years 390 and 405 A. D.

sufficiently beforehand. And with regard to this particular passage it may be said that neither Wellhausen nor any other higher critic can do anything to alter it; because so long as those words *ohel moed,* or "tent of meeting," remain in the various textual authorities which we have quoted, so long it will be impossible to expunge them from our present Hebrew Bible; and no matter what authorities the critics may be able to quote as omitting these words, the preponderance of authority, as matters now stand, will always be in favor of their retention. We claim then a real victory here, in being able to substantiate so conclusively, as we think we have done, the genuineness of this text in Samuel.

But what now is the general result of our examinations with regard to the testimony which Samuel gives us? If our conclusion with regard to the passage just examined is correct, and we are fully persuaded that it is, then we surely have demonstrated in the clearest way that not only in the days of Samuel, but probably long before, the Tabernacle did exist, and was located at Shiloh.

4. TESTIMONY OF JEREMIAH AND PSALM 78

And here, if we care to go still further in this investigation of passages, we might find some very interesting testimony to the Tabernacle's historicity in Psalm 78 and in the prophecy of Jeremiah. But since we wish to be as brief as possible, while not neglecting the real strength of our argument, we will simply indicate, or quote, the Scriptures referred to, and leave the discussion or interpretation of them to the reader himself. One of these passages is found, as said, in Psa. 78, vs. 59, 60, and reads as follows: "When God heard this he was wroth, and greatly abhorred Israel; so that he forsook the *tabernacle of Shiloh, the tent* which he placed among men." Another passage, from Jer. 7:12-14, reads thus: "But go ye now unto *my place which was in Shiloh, where I caused my name to dwell at the first,* and see what I did to it for

the wickedness of my people Israel. Therefore will I do unto the house which is called by my name, wherein ye trust [the temple at Jerusalem], and unto the place which I gave to you and to your fathers, as I have done to Shiloh." Still another passage may be found in Jer. 26:6, and reads: "Then will I make this house like Shiloh, and will make this city [Jerusalem] a curse to all nations of the earth."*

All these passages, it should be observed, compare the Temple at Jerusalem with the Tabernacle at Shiloh; and they express the threat, that, unless the Israelites repented, God would destroy the Temple at Jerusalem, as he had long before destroyed, or removed, the Tabernacle at Shiloh.

5. TESTIMONY OF JUDGES AND JOSHUA

Yet once more, in order to make our story of the Tabernacle complete, it is necessary for us to go back somewhat in history; and so we now quote from the books of Judges and Joshua. In Josh. 18:1 we read: "And the whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled themselves together at Shiloh and set up the *tent of meeting* there." Then, turning over to Judg. 18:31, we again read, about the idolatrous images set up in Dan, that these continued there "all the time that the *house of God* was at Shiloh." From these two passages we learn not only how the "house of God" came to be located at Shiloh—because the children of Israel, probably under the leadership of Joshua, set it up there—but we learn also that the two descriptive terms, "tent of meeting" and "house of God," signify the same thing; for it

*These passages in Jeremiah are very important as evidence in favor of the Tabernacle's real existence, since even the higher critics must admit that the chapters containing them were written a considerable time before the exile; and therefore these passages could not, except upon the violent theory of redaction, have been affected by writings appearing either during or after the exile. And as to Psalm 78, which is even more explicit about the structure at Shiloh's being the old Mosaic Tabernacle, it is much easier to say, as the critics do, that this Psalm is post-exilic, than it is to prove such assertion.

is hardly possible that the "tent of meeting" erected at Shiloh in the days of Joshua had been replaced in the time of the Judges by another structure, different in kind, and now called the "house of God."

6. ARGUMENT FROM HISTORY OF THE SACRED ARK

But now yet, before we give the entire story of the Tabernacle, we desire to notice another kind of argument, which is drawn from the history of the sacred ark. There does not seem to be any notice of the Tabernacle as a structure by itself in the book of Deuteronomy; but in the tenth chapter of this book, verses 1 to 5, there is given an account of the construction, not of the Tabernacle, but of what must be considered as its most important piece of furniture, that is, the Ark of the Covenant, as it is usually called, or as the critics prefer to term it, the Ark of Jahweh (Jehovah). Now, although the critics take a very different view regarding the date and authority of Deuteronomy from that which has always been accepted by orthodox scholars, yet especially upon the ground of the passage referred to, they are willing to admit that at least some kind of a sacred ark was constructed even in the days of Moses. Moreover, if consistent with the facts as recorded in the Bible, the critics cannot deny that this same sacred ark, whatever was its form or purpose, was not only carried by the Israelites on all their journeys through the wilderness, but was also finally located by them at Shiloh; whence, after undergoing various fortunes, it was deposited in the holy of holies of Solomon's Temple. This the critics in general admit; and they are compelled to do so by their own accepted documents of "J," "E," etc.

Now, that being the case, it follows that if the history of the sacred ark can be traced all the way through, or rather all the way back from the days of Solomon's Temple to the days of Moses, somewhat the same thing can be done also with the Tabernacle. For the Tabernacle, as is very evident

from what the critics call the Priestly Document, was built, among other purposes, for the housing of this sacred ark; and the same documentary evidence which establishes that fact establishes also the farther fact that for a long period such was really the case. That is to say, the sacred ark and the old Mosaic Tabernacle went together, according to Biblical history, down to the times of Shiloh; and they were, after some period of separation, even brought together again at the dedicatory services of Solomon's Temple. To be sure, not all of this is admitted by the critics; but they cannot deny that the same old ark, which, according to Deut. 10:1-5, was built by Moses, was finally deposited in Solomon's Temple.* With this much conceded, all the rest that we have claimed must necessarily follow; or, in other words, the admitted history of the Ark of Jehovah establishes also the historicity of the Mosaic Tabernacle, or at least helps to do so.

IX. ENTIRE STORY OF THE TABERNACLE

Now then we are prepared to give the entire story of that old structure which was built at Mt. Sinai; only one item being still lacking. This we can learn from 1 Sam., Chaps. 21 and 22; and it is, that for a brief period the Tabernacle seems to have been located at Nob, some distance south of Shiloh. With this item then supplied, our story may go forward. As vouched for by the different historic notices we have been considering, it is as follows:

Built by the Israelites near Mt. Sinai, it was afterward carried by that people all through the wilderness. Then, having crossed the Jordan with them, and being set up at Shiloh, it seems for a long time to have remained in that

*Wellhausen positively states that according to the Law, that is, the Priestly Document, the Tabernacle is "the inseparable companion of the ark," and that "The two things necessarily belong to each other." He also admits, on the ground of other Biblical evidence, that toward the end of the period of Judges there are distinct traces of the ark as existing; moreover, that this same "ark of Jehovah" was finally deposited in Solomon's Temple. (See Proleg., Eng. Trans., pp. 41, 42.)

place. Next, for a brief period, it would appear to have been located at Nob, down in the Benjaminite country; and from this point being carried a little to the north and west, it was set up at Gibeon, where it seems to have remained for many years. And finally upon the erection of the temple in Jerusalem, it was transferred to that place, and stored away there for safe-keeping; and this is the last notice which the Bible gives of it as a matter of history. It had served its purpose, and the time came now for it to be laid aside as a memorial, or to give place for another and a more imposing structure.

X. INTIMATE CONNECTION OF THIS STORY WITH OTHER BIBLICAL HISTORY

Speaking somewhere of the extraordinary influence exerted by Christianity in our world, Renan says that any attempt to separate this religion from the history of humanity would be like "tearing up the tree of civilization by its roots." Very much like that, it seems to us, is the intimacy of relation existing between the history of the Tabernacle and all the rest of the history recorded in the Old Testament. Any attempt, therefore, such as that which is made by the critics, to remove the Tabernacle as a matter of fact from Old Testament history, or to turn it into a mere fiction, would necessarily result in failure. It would do so because the effect of it would be really to destroy all the surrounding and connected history given in the Old Testament; which is, of course, impossible. The very extravagance, therefore, of this higher-critic theory, or the vastness of its undertaking, is a sure proof of its inherent falsity. Dr. Valpy French, considering only the peculiar construction of this Tabernacle story, how wide-reaching it is, and how it is made to conform so accurately with many details of archæology and topography, pronounces it, if viewed as a mere fiction, "a literary impossibility;" and he suggests that a simpler method to be employed by the critics, in getting rid of this troublesome story, would be for

them "to credit the last redactor with the authorship of the whole Old Testament Scriptures." So also Professor Sayce affirms that, regarded as an invention, the Tabernacle story is "too elaborate, too detailed to be conceivable."

XI. OBJECTIONS OF THE HIGHER CRITICS

It remains for us yet, in order to render our discussion really complete, to notice a few of the many objections which the higher critics have brought forward against the Tabernacle's historicity. These objections, however, are, for the most part, so very frivolous in character, or so utterly lacking in support either from fact or reason, that they do not really deserve an answer. Nevertheless, to furnish the reader with some notion of their real character, we will undertake to give them a cursory examination.

They may all be divided into four classes. The first class embraces all those objections which are based upon the idea that the account given in the Bible of the Tabernacle's construction and services, is very unrealistic or impractical in its nature.

A second class proceeds on the notion that the Mosaic Tabernacle is altogether too costly, highly artistic, and ponderous an affair, to have been produced by the Israelites at Mt. Sinai, and afterward carried by them all through the wilderness.

Another of these classes—which is really only one objection—represents that in the very oldest sources out of which the Pentateuch was, according to the critic notion, constructed, there is mention made of another tent, much smaller than was the Mosaic Tabernacle, and different from that structure also in other respects; and that, therefore, this second tabernacle, as it may be called, being better substantiated by literary documents than is the Mosaic structure, it is not consistent with an acceptance of all the facts in the case to allow that the larger or Mosaic tent really existed.

And finally, there is still one class, or a single objection, which makes bold to affirm that in all the earlier historic books of the Old Testament, even from Judges to 2 Kings, there is no sure mention made of the Tabernacle as a real existence.

Now, if we were to try to answer all these objections, it might be said of the last one, that it is already answered. We have answered that objection by showing not only that there is mention made in those earlier historic books of the Old Testament of the Tabernacle as a real existence, but also that this mention is both sure and abundant. The many historical notices which we have examined, all telling about the Tabernacle's construction and history, is positive proof to that effect.

Then, furthermore, with regard to the alleged fact that in the earliest sources, out of which according to the critic theory the Pentateuch was constructed, there is mention made of another or second tent, different from the Mosaic structure, we have to say with respect to this objection, first of all, that it is far from being proven that there are in the Pentateuch any such oldest sources as the critics allege. That item is only a part of the still unproven theory of the higher critics, in their interpretation of the Old Testament.* And then, secondly, we might say, respecting this objection, that it is a difficulty which orthodox scholars have often noticed and which they have explained in various ways. Perhaps the best explanation is to allow the reality of the difficulty and to attribute it to some obscurity or even seeming contradiction existing in the Pentateuchal notices. But

*The fact of the higher-critic theory being as yet in an unproven state might be urged as one important consideration in favor of the Tabernacle's real existence; and especially could such an argument be legitimately made, inasmuch as the proof of the correctness of that theory does not all come from an assured non-existence of the Mosaic structure. But since an argument of that kind would be, to some extent at least, "reasoning in a circle," we do not make use of it.

whatever the real difficulty may be, it certainly is not insuperable; and a very good explanation of it is that there were really two tents, but one of them, that is, the smaller tent, was only a kind of provisional structure, perhaps the dwelling-place of Moses, which was used also for religious purposes, while the larger or Sinaitic Tabernacle was being prepared.* With some allowance for one or two statements made in the Pentateuch which seem not fully to accord with this view, it will answer all the real exigencies of the case. Or, at all events, nearly any explanation which preserves the integrity of the Pentateuchal literature, and tries to reconcile its seeming differences of statement, on the ground that this literature deals with facts, and is not in large share pure fiction, is vastly preferable to any of the theories which the critics have thus far advanced with regard to this matter.

There remain then only two classes of objections which need still to be answered. And with regard to one of these classes, that is, the first in our list, it may be stated that although the objections put forward under this head are quite numerous, yet a single illustration of them will show how utterly lacking in substantial character or reasonableness

*Notices of such smaller tent seem to be made in Ex. 33:7-11; Num. 11:16; 12:4, 5, and Deut. 31:14, 15; and from these various passages the critics claim that they can discover at least three points of difference existing between this smaller tent and the larger or Levitical one. These differences are as follows: (1) The smaller tent was always pitched outside the camp; but according to the priestly or Levitical history the larger tent was located within the camp. (2) The smaller tent was only a place of Jehovah's revelation, or of his communing with his people; but the larger or priestly structure was, besides, a place of most elaborate worship. (3) In the Levitical or larger tent the priests and Levites regularly served, but in the smaller structure it was only Joshua, the "servant" of Moses, who had charge of the building.

All these differences, however, are easily explained by the theory, given above, of there having been really two tents. Besides, it should be observed that after Moses' death no further mention is made in the Scriptures of this smaller structure; which fact would seem to be a strong proof that the smaller one of the two tents was, primarily at least, a private structure used by Moses.

each and all of them really are. The illustration of which we will make use is taken from Bishop Colenso's famous attack upon the truthfulness of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. In that attack he puts forward the singular objection that the Tabernacle was, in its dimensions, far too small to accommodate all the vast host of the Israelites standing before its door, as the Scriptures seem to indicate was the case with them on a few occasions.* That vast host must have numbered, according to the data given in the Pentateuch, as many at least as some two millions of people; and now Colenso makes the objection that this great host, standing in ranks, as he would make it, of nine, one rank behind another, in front of the Tabernacle door, would have formed a procession some *sixty miles long;* which, surely, would have been not only a practical impossibility so far as their gathering at the door of the Tabernacle was concerned, but would have been also a complete demonstration of the untruthfulness or unreliability of this Pentateuchal record.

But there is one thing connected with this record which Bishop Colenso seems not to have understood. It is that when the author of it was speaking of the whole congregation of Israel as standing, or gathered, in front of the Tabernacle door, he was speaking only in general terms. His language then would imply, not that every individual belonging to the vast Israelitish host stood at the place mentioned, but only that a large and representative multitude of these people was thus gathered. Or the words might signify that even the whole congregation of the Israelites was, on a few occasions, gathered about the Tabernacle, as it had been gathered around Mt. Sinai when the law was given—not all the people near the Tabernacle door, but only the leaders, while the great body of the congregation stood behind them, or around

*Vid. Lev. 8:35; Num. 10:3, and 27:18-22. Also comp. Num. 16:16-19.

the structure, like a great sea of human beings stretching away in the distance.

Either of these explanations would meet all the demands of the language used; and, as Dr. Orr has remarked, some least particle of common sense must be allowed to the writer of this Pentateuchal record; otherwise, with the "crude absurdities" attributed to him by Bishop Colenso, he could never have written anything in the least degree rational, or that would bear a moment's reflection even by himself. Besides, as Dr. Orr has noticed, it is only a customary way of speaking to say that a whole town or even a large city was gathered together in mass-convention, when the place of such meeting was perhaps only some large hall or good-sized church. Before attacking, therefore, so eagerly with his arithmetical calculations the truthfulness of the Biblical account, this higher-critic bishop would have done well to have reflected a little upon the common use of language. That would have saved him from falling into a bigger blunder than he tries to fasten upon the writer of this Pentateuchal record.

XII. GREATEST OF THE OBJECTIONS

But there is still one objection raised by the critics which seems to be more serious in nature. It is an objection based upon what may be called a physical impossibility, or the incompetency of the Israelites, while at Mt. Sinai or journeying through the desert, either to construct or carry with them such a ponderous, highly artistic and costly a fabric as was the Sinaitic Tabernacle. These people in the desert and at Mt. Sinai, we are told, were the merest wandering Bedouins, having but little civilization and being "poor even to beggary;" and of course such a people possessed neither the means nor the intellectual capability necessary for the construction and transportation of the Tabernacle.

This peculiar objection, however, rests upon at least two mistakes. The first one is that the Israelites at this time were

in such extreme poverty. The Bible tells us that when the children of Israel left Egypt they went out "every man armed;" and they carried with them all their herds and flocks, leaving "not a hoof behind." Moreover, by means of the many gifts, or exactions of "jewels of silver" and "jewels of gold" which they received from the Egyptians, they "utterly spoiled" that people. Such is the representation given in the Bible. And then, too, when these Israelites came to Mt. Sinai, here also, according to the reports of modern travelers and explorers, they could have found various materials necessary for constructing the Tabernacle, such as an abundance of copper existing in mines, various kinds of precious stones, as well as, growing in this region in considerable abundance, the shittim-wood or acacia tree, out of which the boards and pillars and most of the furniture of the Tabernacle were actually constructed. So far, therefore, as possessing, or being able to get, the means necessary for a construction of the Tabernacle was concerned, these people would seem to have been pretty well supplied.

And then, with regard to the other mistake made by the critics, viz., that these Israelites were intellectually incompetent to build the Tabernacle, this assertion also is not substantiated by facts. For, in the first place, it should be remembered that all these Hebrews had from their birth dwelt in Egypt, a country which, of all lands in the world, was at that time the most advanced in all kinds of mechanical, architectural and industrial art. This, e. g., was the country where the great pyramids had been produced, and where existed, at that time, at least most of the magnificent temples, tombs, obelisks, statues and palaces, the ruins of which still remain. Accordingly, when the children of Israel came out of Egypt, they must have brought with them a good amount of the architectural and mechanical wisdom peculiar to that country. Moreover, we are taught in the Bible that these people, while in Egypt, dwelt in houses; which, of course, they must have

built for themselves; also that, as slaves, their lives had been made bitter by "all manner of service in the field," and by "hard service in brick and in mortar," and that they had built "store-cities," such as Pithom and Raamses. Putting, therefore, all these experiences which the Israelites had in Egypt together, it can be easily seen how they could have learned, even from the Egyptians, sufficient wisdom to construct and transport the Tabernacle.

But if we are required yet to name any one particular achievement, ever accomplished by these people, that was great enough to warrant the belief of their being able to construct and carry with them all through the wilderness the Sinaitic Tabernacle, then, both with promptness and high appreciation, we point to that very extraordinary conquest which they made of the Holy Land, and also to the almost equally extraordinarily long march made by them through the wilderness; and we wish to say that any people who could accomplish two such prodigious deeds as were these could easily have accomplished the so much easier task of building and transporting the old Mosaic "tent of meeting."

Our conclusion, therefore, is that, all teachings of the higher critics to the contrary notwithstanding, those Israelitish people were abundantly competent, both in point of intellectual ability and of material supplies, to accomplish each and all of the works which are accredited them in the Bible.

XIII. MARKS OF EGYPT AND THE DESERT

But this line of argument is one that can be pursued to a much greater extent, and it can be shown that instead of the conditions surrounding the Israelites at Mt. Sinai and while they were in the wilderness being against the truthfulness of the Biblical record appertaining to those matters, such conditions are really in favor of that record's truthfulness, as well as of the Tabernacle's real existence. For illustration, we are told in the Bible that the wood out of which a

large part of the Tabernacle was constructed, was not taken from the lofty cedars growing in Lebanon, nor from the sycamores growing in the Palestinean valleys, but from the humble acacia or shittim-wood tree, which, as we have already seen, flourishes quite plentifully in the Sinaitic region; all of which particulars accord fully with the topographical facts in the case. So also, if we are to believe in the testimonies of ancient Egyptian monuments and the results of modern Egyptian explorations, there is many a resemblance which can be found to exist between matters connected with old Egyptian temples, their structure, furniture, priesthood and services, and other like matters appertaining to the Tabernacle. Indeed, some of these resemblances go so far in their minute details as to an arrangement of buildings according to the points of compass—a peculiarity which was found both in Egypt and in connection with the Tabernacle; different apartments in the structure, graded according to sanctity; the possession of a sacred ark or chest, peculiarly built and located; strange winged figures, which as existing in the Tabernacle were called "cherubim;" a gradation of the priests; priestly dress and ornaments; the breast-plate and mitre worn by the high-priest; different animals offered in sacrifice; the burning of incense, etc., that the impression left upon the mind of a person who knows about these things as existing in ancient Egypt and then reads in the Bible about similar matters connected with the Tabernacle is, that whoever wrote this Biblical account must himself have been in Egypt and have seen the old Egyptian worship and temples, in order to make his record conform in so many respects to what was found in that country.*

*Prof. Sayce undertakes to show that the foreign influences affecting the structure of the Tabernacle and the nature of its services came rather from Babylonia and Assyria than from Egypt, yet, so far as all the topographical items mentioned above are concerned, they can all be abundantly substantiated by facts from history and archaeology.

So also if we give attention to the peculiar experiences had by the Israelites during their march through the wilderness, we shall see from what the Bible tells us about their setting up and taking down the Tabernacle; about the wagons furnished for its transportation; about the pillar of cloud going before it or resting upon it, in connection with their long march; also about the necessity of going outside of the camp in order to perform some of the Tabernacle services,—from all these and various other indications given in the Bible, we can surely perceive that the conditions of these people were such as to warrant the belief that they did indeed, as the Bible represents, journey through a wilderness, and that they carried with them their tent of worship.

In his book, entitled "Nature and the Supernatural," Dr. Horace Bushnell tells of an important legal case that once was gained by one of the lawyers noticing, in the web of a sheet of paper which he held in his hand, certain "water-marks" which had been made in the paper during the process of its manufacture. These water-marks being indelible, they served as the best kind of proof of certain facts which it was desired to establish. And so we would characterize all those evidences coming from a correspondence of the Bible account with archæological facts, which have to do with the Israelites being in Egypt and their journeying through the Sinaitic desert, as so many water-marks left indelibly, not upon, but in the very web of the Biblical record; proving not only the undeniable truthfulness of this record, but also the real existence of the Tabernacle.

XIV. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

To sum up then the different points which we have endeavored to make in our argument, it will be remembered that, in the first place, after having outlined our general proposition, and after having from various considerations shown the importance of its discussion, we affirmed that there

are certain great presumptions which lie in the way of our accepting the higher-critic theory as true. Next we introduced some archæological and other testimony external to the Bible, which we found to be helpful in proving the Tabernacle's historicity. And then, by quite an extended examination of the many historical notices respecting the Tabernacle, or respecting the sacred ark as connected with it, which are found in the Old Testament, we established, we think, as a matter beyond all reasonable doubt, the actual historicity of this structure; showing how it was built near Mt. Sinai and then was known to exist continuously for some five hundred years, or from the time of Moses unto the time of David and Solomon. And then, finally, to make our argument as complete as possible, we noticed, somewhat briefly and yet with considerable fullness, the many objections which the higher critics have raised against the Tabernacle's existence, showing that none of these objections is really valid, and turning the last one into a positive proof on our side of the question.

XV. CONCLUSION

And now, if there remains yet anything which needs to be said, it seems to us it is only the assertion that, whether the higher critics will admit it or not, the old Mosaic Tabernacle surely did exist. Or if there are persons who, in spite of all the numerous important testimonies which we have adduced from the Bible and other sources to the Tabernacle's historicity, still persist in denying such evidence, and in saying that the whole matter was only a priestly fiction, then what the Savior says, with respect perhaps to some of the skeptics living in his day, is quite applicable: "If they believe not Moses and the prophets, neither would they believe though one rose from the dead." Or, to state the case a little differently and somewhat humorously, it might be said that the fact of any person's denying the real existence of the Taber-

nacle, when so much positive evidence exists in favor of it, reminds one of what Lord Byron says with regard to Bishop Berkeley's philosophical denial of the existence of matter:

"When Bishop Berkeley says it is no matter.
Then 'tis no matter what he says."

But if the Tabernacle in the wilderness did really exist, then what becomes of the peculiar theory of the higher critics? That necessarily falls to the ground, or is proven to be untrue; for, as was shown in the early part of this discussion, the entire critic hypothesis rests upon, or has for one of its main pillars, the assumed non-existence of the Tabernacle, or what amounts to the same thing, the alleged late origin of the Mosaic ritualistic law. Both of these premises being now demonstrated to be unsound, the Tabernacle "which Moses made in the wilderness" will very likely remain where the Bible puts it—among the great undeniable facts of the world's history, and not, as the critics would have it, among fictions or forgeries.

ADDENDA

VARIOUS FACTS RESPECTING PLACES WHERE THE TABERNACLE WAS BUILT OR LOCATED

I. MOUNT SINAI

ITS LOCATION AND PRESENT APPEARANCE

Dr. J. W. Dawson, in his "Modern Science in Bible Lands," gives the following facts with regard to the location and present appearance of the mountain near which the Tabernacle was built.

"The actual position of Mount Sinai has been a subject of keen controversy, which may be reduced to two questions: 1st, Was Mount Sinai in the peninsula of that name or elsewhere? 2d, Which of the mountains of the peninsula was the Mount of the Law? As to the

first of these questions, the claims of the peninsula are supported by an overwhelming mass of tradition and of authority, ancient and modern.

"If this question be considered as settled, then it remains to inquire which of the mountain summits of that group of hills in the southern end of the peninsula, which seems to be designated in the Bible by the general name of Horeb, should be regarded as the veritable 'Mount of the Law?' Five of the mountain summits of this region have laid claim to this distinction; and their relative merits the explorers [those of the English Ordnance Survey] test by seven criteria which must be fulfilled by the actual mountain. These are: (1) A mountain overlooking a plain on which the millions of Israel could be assembled. (2) Space for the people to 'remove and stand afar off' when the voice of the Lord was heard, and yet to hear that voice. (3) A defined peak distinctly visible from the plain. (4) A mountain so precipitous that the people might be said to stand under it and to touch its base. (5) A mountain capable of being isolated by boundaries. (6) A mountain with springs and streams of water in its vicinity. (7) Pasturage to maintain the flocks of the people for a year.

"By these criteria the surveyors reject two of the mountains, Jebel el Ejmeh and Jebel Ummalawi, as destitute of sufficient water and pasturage. Jebel Katharina, whose claims arise from a statement of Josephus that Sinai was the highest mountain of the district, which this peak actually is, with the exception of a neighboring summit twenty-five feet higher, they reject because of the fact that it is not visible from any plain suitable for the encampment of the Israelites. Mount Serbal has in modern times had some advocates; but the surveyors allege in opposition to these that they do not find, as has been stated, the Sinaitic inscriptions more plentiful there than elsewhere, that the traces of early Christian occupancy do not point to it any more than early tradition, and that it does not meet the topographical requirements in presenting a defined peak, convenient camping-ground, or a sufficient amount of pasturage.

"There only remains the long-established and venerated Jebel Musa—the orthodox Sinai; and this, in a remarkable and conspicuous manner, fulfils the required conditions, and, besides, illustrates the narrative itself in unexpected ways. This mountain has, however, two dominant peaks, that of Jebel Musa proper, 7,363 feet in height, and that of Ras Sufsafeh, 6,937 feet high; and of these the

explorers do not hesitate at once to prefer the latter. This peak or ridge is described as almost isolated, as descending precipitously to the great plain of the district, Er Rahah, which is capable of accommodating two millions of persons in full view of the peak, and has ample camping ground for the whole host in its tributary valleys. Further, it is so completely separated from the neighboring mountains that a short and quite intelligible description would define its limits, which could be easily marked out.

"Another remarkable feature is, that we have here the brook descending out of the mount referred to in Exodus (Ch. 32:20), and, besides this, five other perennial streams in addition to many good springs. The country is by no means desert, but supplies much pasturage; and when irrigated and attended to, forms good gardens, and is indeed one of the best and most fertile spots of the whole peninsula. The explorers show that the statements of some hasty travelers who have given a different view are quite incorrect, and also that there is reason to believe that there was greater rainfall and more verdure in ancient times than at present in this part of the country. They further indicate the Wady Shreick, in which is the stream descending from the mount, as the probable place of the making and destruction of the golden calf, and a hill known as Jebel Moneijeh, the mount of conference, as the probable site of the Tabernacle. They think it not improbable that while Ras Sufsafeh was the Mount of the Law, the retirement of Moses during his sojourn on the mount may have been behind the peak, in the recesses of Jebel Musa, which thus might properly bear his name."

II. SHILOH

ITS RUINS AS RECENTLY INVESTIGATED

Colonel Sir Charles Wilson thus describes the present ruins of Shiloh, in "Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement" for 1873, pp. 37, 38:

"The ruins of Seilûn (Shiloh) cover the surface of a 'tell,' or mound, on a spur which lies between two valleys, that unite about a quarter of a mile above Khan Lubban, and thence run to the sea. The existing remains are those of a *fellahin* village, with few earlier foundations, possibly of the date of the Crusades. The walls are built with old materials, but none of the fragments of columns mentioned by some travelers can now be seen. On the summit are a few heavy foundations, perhaps those of a keep, and on the southern side is a building with a heavy sloping buttress. The rock is exposed over nearly the whole surface, so that little can be expected from

excavation. Northwards, the 'tell' slopes down to a broad shoulder across which a sort of level court, 77 feet wide and 412 feet long, has been cut out. The rock is in places scarped to a height of five feet, and along the sides are several excavations and a few small cisterns. The level portion of the rock is covered by a few inches of soil. It is not improbable that the place was thus prepared to receive the Tabernacle, which, according to Rabbinical traditions, was a structure of low stone walls, with the tent stretched over the top. At any rate, there is no other level space on the 'tell' sufficiently large to receive a tent of the dimensions of the Tabernacle.

"The spring of Seilûn is in a small valley which joins the main one a short distance northeast of the ruins. The supply, which is small, after running a few yards through a subterranean channel, was formerly led into a rock-hewn reservoir, but now runs to waste."

To the above items Major Claude R. Conder, R. E., in his "Tent Life in Palestine," Vol I, pp. 81, 82, adds as follows:

"There is no site in the country fixed with greater certainty than that of Shiloh. The modern name Seilûn preserves the most archaic form, which is found in the Bible in the ethnic Shilonite (1 Kings 11:29). The position of the ruins agrees exactly with the very definite description given in the Old Testament of the position of Shiloh, as 'on the north side of Bethel (now Beitin), on the east side of the highway that goeth up from Bethel to Shechem, and on the south of Lebonah' (Lubbin) (Judg. 21:19). It is just here that Shiloh still stands in ruins. The scenery of the wild mountains is finer than that in Judea; the red color of the cliffs, which are of great height, is far more picturesque than the shapeless chalk mountains near Jerusalem; the fig gardens and olive groves are more luxuriant, but the crops are poor compared with the plain and round Bethlehem. A deep valley runs behind the town on the north, and in its sides are many rock-cut sepulchers.

"The vineyards of Shiloh have disappeared, though very possibly once surrounding the spring, and perhaps extending down the valley westwards, where water is also found. With the destruction of the village, desolation has spread over the barren hills around."

III. NOB

SITE OF THE VILLAGE IDENTIFIED

So thinks Rev. W. Shaw Caldecott. See his treatise on "The Tabernacle, Its History and Structure," pp. 53, 54:

"Four miles to the north of Jerusalem, and at the distance of a quarter of a mile to the east of the main road, is a curiously knobbed

and double-topped hill, named by the Arabs *Tell* (or Tuleil) *el-Full.* The crown of this hill is thirty feet higher than Mount Zion, and Jerusalem can be plainly seen from it. On its top is a large pyramidal mound of unhewn stones, which Robinson supposes to have been originally a square tower of 40 or 50 feet, and to have been violently thrown down. No other foundations are to be seen. At the foot of the hill are ancient substructions, built of large unhewn stones in low, massive walls. These are on the south side, and adjoin the great road.

"If we take the Scriptural indications as to the site of Nob (height), this hill and these ruins fulfill all the conditions of the case.

"(a) Nob was so far regarded as belonging to Jerusalem, as one of its villages (thus involving its proximity), that David's bringing Goliath's head and sword to the Tabernacle at Nob was regarded as bringing them to Jerusalem (1 Sam. 17:54).

"(b) A clearer indication as to its situation is, however, gained by the record of the restoration towns and villages in which Nob is mentioned, the name occurring between those of Anathoth and Ananiah (Neh. 11:32). These two places still bear practically the same names, and their sites are well known. In the narrow space between Anata and Hanina stands the hill Tell el-Full, which we take to be ancient Nob.

"(c) Another indication is contained in Isaiah's account of Sennacherib's march on Jerusalem, the picturesque climax of which is, 'This very day shall he halt at Nob; he shaketh his hand at the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem' (Isa. 10:28-32). There are only two hills on the north from which the city can be seen, so as to give reality to the poet's words. One of these is *Neby Samwil,* and the other is *Tell el-Full.*"

IV. GIBEON

IDENTITY OF ANCIENT CITY WITH EL-JIB, ALSO THE "GREAT HIGH PLACE," OF 1 KINGS 3:4, INDICATED

In Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible,* Art. Gibeon, J. F. Stenning says as follows:

"The identity of Gibeon with the village of El-Jib, which lies some six or seven miles northwest of Jerusalem, is practically beyond dispute. The modern village still preserves the first part of the older name, while its situation agrees in every respect with the requirements of the history of the Old Testament. Just beyond Tell el-Full (Gibeah), the main road north from Jerusalem to Beitin (Bethel) is joined by a branch road leading up from the coast. The latter forms the con-

tinuation of the most southerly of three routes which connect the Jordan valley with the Maritime Plains. * * * Now just before this road (coming up from the Jordan valley) leaves the higher ground and descends to the Shepheleh, it divides into two, the one branch leading down to the Wady Suleiman, the other running in a more southerly direction by way of the Bethhorons. Here, on this fertile, open plateau, slightly to the south of the main road, rises the hill on which the modern village of El-Jib is built, right on the frontier line which traverses the central range to the south of Bethel. It was the natural pass across Palestine, which in early times served as the political border between North and South Israel, and it was owing to its position that Gibeon acquired so much prominence in the reigns of David and Solomon. A short distance to the east of the village, at the foot of the hill, there is, further, a stone tank or reservoir of considerable size, supplied by a spring which rises in a cave higher up."

This spring, the explorers tell us, was probably the ancient "pool of Gibeon" mentioned in 2 Sam. 2:13.

Also, respecting the "great high place," Smith's *Dictionary* has the following:

"The most natural position for the high place of Gibeon is the twin mountain immediately south of El-Jib, so close as to be all but a part of the town, and yet quite separate and distinct. The testimony of Epiphanius, viz., that the 'Mount of Gibeon' was the highest round Jerusalem, by which Dean Stanley supports his conjecture (that the present Neby Samwil was the great high place), should be received with caution, standing, as it does, quite alone and belonging to an age which, though early, was marked by ignorance and by the most improbable conclusions."

Some additional facts, as given by Rev. W. Shaw Caldecott (ibid. pp. 60-62), are as follows:

"El-Jib is built upon an isolated oblong hill standing in a plain or basin of great fertility. The northern end of the hill is covered over with old massive ruins, which have fallen down in every direction, and in which the villagers now live. Across the plain to the south is the lofty range of Neby Samwil. * * * Gibeon was one of the four towns in the division of Benjamin given as residences for the sons of Aaron (Josh. 21:17). It was thus already inhabited by priests, and this, added to its other advantages, made it, humanly speaking, a not unsuitable place for the capital of the new kingdom. No remains of (very ancient) buildings have been discovered, such as those of er-Ramah and Tell el-Full."

CHAPTER IX

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

BY CANON G. OSBORNE TROOP, M. A.,
MONTREAL, CANADA

The whole Bible is stamped with the Divine "Hall-Mark"; but the Gospel according to St. John is *primus inter pares.* Through it, as through a transparency, we gaze entranced into the very holy of holies, where shines in unearthly glory "the great vision of the face of Christ". Yet man's perversity has made it the "storm center" of New Testament criticism, doubtless for the very reason that it bears such unwavering testimony both to the deity of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and to His perfect humanity. The Christ of the Fourth Gospel is no unhistoric, idealized vision of the later, dreaming church, but is, as it practically claims to be, the picture drawn by "the disciple whom Jesus loved", an eye-witness of the blood and water that flowed from His pierced side. These may appear to be mere unsupported statements, and as such will at once be dismissed by a scientific reader. Nevertheless the appeal of this article is to the instinct of the "one flock" of the "one Shepherd". "They know His voice" . . . "a stranger will they not follow."

1. There is one passage in this Gospel that flashes like lightning—it dazzles our eyes by its very glory. To the broken-hearted Martha the Lord Jesus says with startling suddenness, "*I am* the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on Me, though he die, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me, shall never die."

It is humbly but confidently submitted that these words are utterly beyond the reach of human invention. It could

never have entered the heart of man to say, "*I am* the resurrection and the life." "There is a resurrection and a life," would have been a great and notable saying, but *this Speaker* identifies *Himself* with the resurrection and with life eternal. The words can only be born from above, and He who utters them is worthy of the utmost adoration of the surrendered soul.

In an earlier chapter John records a certain question addressed to and answered by our Lord in a manner which has no counterpart in the world's literature. "What shall we do," the eager people cry; "What shall we do that we might work the works of God?" "This is the work of God", our Lord replies, "that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent" (John 6:28, 29). I venture to say that such an answer to such a question has no parallel. This is the work of God that ye accept ME. I am the Root of the tree which bears the only fruit pleasing to God. Our Lord states the converse of this in chapter 16, when He says that the Holy Spirit will "convict the world of sin . . . because they believe not on ME." The root of all evil is unbelief in Christ. The condemning sin of the world lies in the rejection of the Redeemer. Here we have the root of righteousness and the root of sin in the acceptance or rejection of His wondrous personality. This is unique, and proclaims the Speaker to be "separate from sinners" though "the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." Truly,

> "He is His own best evidence,
> His witness is within."

2. Pass on to the fourteenth chapter, so loved of all Christians. Listen to that Voice, which is as the voice of many waters, as it sounds in the ears of the troubled disciples: "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe *also* in *ME*. In My Father's house are many mansions: *if it were not so, I would have told you.* I go to prepare a place

for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also."

Who is he who dares to say: "Ye believe in *God,* believe *also* in Me"? He ventures thus to speak because He is the Father's Son. Man's son is man: can God's Son be anything less than God? Elsewhere in this Gospel He says: "I and the Father are one". The fourteenth chapter reveals the Lord Jesus as completely at home in the heavenly company. He speaks of His Father and of the Holy Spirit as Himself being one of the utterly holy Family. He knows all about His Father's house with its many mansions. He was familiar with it before the world was. Mark well, too, the exquisite touch of transparent truthfulness: "If it were not so, I would have told you." An *ear*-witness alone could have caught and preserved that touching parenthesis, and who more likely than the disciple whom Jesus loved?

As we leave this famous chapter let us not forget to note the wondrous words in verse 23: "If a man love Me, he will keep My words; and My Father will love him, and *WE* will come unto him and make our abode with him."

This saying can only be characterized as blasphemous, if it be not the true utterance of one equal with God. On the other hand, does any reasonable man seriously think that such words originated in the mind of a forger? "Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice", and surely that voice is here.

3. When we come to chapter 17 we pass indeed into the very inner chamber of the King of kings. It records the high-priestly prayer of our Lord, when He "lifted up His eyes to heaven and said, Father, the hour is come, glorify Thy Son that Thy Son may also glorify Thee." Let any man propose to himself the awful task of forging such a prayer, and putting it into the mouth of an imaginary Christ. The brain reels at the very thought of it. It is, however, per-

fectly natural that St. John should record it. It must have fallen upon the ears of himself and his fellow-disciples amidst an awe-stricken silence in which they could hear the very throbbing of their listening hearts. For their very hearts were listening through their ears as the Son poured out His soul unto the Father. It is a rare privilege, and one from which most men would sensitively shrink, to listen even to a fellow-man alone with God. Yet the Lord Jesus in the midst of His disciples laid bare His very soul before His Father, as really as if He had been alone with Him. He prayed with the cross and its awful death full in view, but in the prayer there is no slightest hint of failure or regret, and there is no trace of confession of sin or need of forgiveness. These are all indelible marks of genuineness. It would have been impossible for a sinful man to conceive such a prayer. But all is consistent with the character of Him who "spake as never man spake", and could challenge the world to convict Him of sin.

With such thoughts in mind let us now look more closely into the words of the prayer itself.

"Father, the hour is come; glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee: As Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him. And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and *Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.*"

Here we have again the calm placing of Himself on a level with the Father in connection with eternal life. And it is not out of place to recall the consistency of this utterance with that often-called "Johannine" saying recorded in St. Matthew and St. Luke: "All things are delivered unto Me of My Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him."

We read also in St. John 14:6: "No man cometh unto

the Father but by Me". And as we reverently proceed further in the prayer we find Him saying: "And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self, with the glory which I had with Thee *before the world was.*"

These words are natural to the Father's Son as we know and worship Him, but they are beyond the reach of an uninspired man, and who can imagine a forger inspired of the Holy Ghost? Such words would, however, be graven upon the very heart of an ear-witness such as the disciple whom Jesus loved.

We have in this prayer also the fuller revelation of the "one flock" and "one Shepherd" pictured in chapter ten: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one; *as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us:* That *the world* may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one; and that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and *hast loved them, as Thou hast loved Me.*"

In these holy words there breathes a cry for such a unity as never entered into the heart of mortal man to dream of. It is no cold and formal ecclesiastical unity, such as that suggested by the curious and unhappy mistranslation of "one fold" for "one flock" in St. John 10:16. It is the living unity of the living flock with the living Shepherd of the living God. It is actually the same as the unity subsisting between the Father and the Son. And according to St. Paul in Rom. 8:19, the creation is waiting for its revelation. The one Shepherd has from the beginning had His one flock in answer to His prayer, but the world has not yet seen it, and is therefore still unconvinced that our Jesus is indeed the Sent of God. The world has seen the Catholic Church and the Roman Catholic Church, but the Holy Catholic Church

no eye as yet has seen but God's. For the Holy Catholic Church and the Shepherd's one flock are one and the same, and the world will not see either "till He come." The *Holy* Catholic Church is an object of faith and not of sight, and so is the one flock. In spite of all attempts at elimination and organization wheat and tares together grow, and sheep and wolves-in-sheep's-clothing are found together in the earthly pasture grounds. But when the Good Shepherd returns He will bring His beautiful flock with Him, and eventually the world will see and believe. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!"

The mystery of this spiritual unity lies hidden in the high-priestly prayer, but we may feel sure that no forger could ever discover it, for many of those who profess and call themselves Christians are blind to it even yet.

4. The "Christ before Pilate" of St. John is also stamped with every mark of sincerity and truth. What mere human imagination could evolve the noble words: "My kingdom is not of this world; if My kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is My kingdom not from hence . . . To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice"?

The whole wondrous story of the betrayal, the denial, the trial, the condemnation and crucifixion of the Lord Jesus, as given through St. John, breathes with the living sympathy of an eye-witness. The account, moreover, is as wonderful in the delicacy of its reserve as in the simplicity of its recital. It is entirely free from sensationalism and every form of exaggeration. It is calm and judicial in the highest degree. If it is written by the inspired disciple whom Jesus loved, all is natural and easily "understanded of the people"; while on

any other supposition, it is fraught with difficulties that cannot be explained away. "I am not credulous enough to be an unbeliever," is a wise saying in this as in many similar connections.

5. The Gospel opens and closes with surpassing grandeur. With Divine dignity it links itself with the opening words of Genesis: "*In the beginning* was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was *God*. . . . And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." What a lifelike contrast with this sublime description is found in the introduction of John the Baptist: "There came *a man* sent from God whose name was John". In the incarnation Christ did not become *a* man but *man*. Moreover in this St. Paul and St. John are in entire agreement.

"There is one God", says St. Paul to Timothy; "one Mediator also between God and man—*Himself Man*—Christ Jesus." The reality of the Divine Redeemer's human nature is beautifully manifested in the touching interview between the weary Saviour and the guilty Samaritan woman at the well; as also in His perfect human friendship with Mary and Martha and their brother Lazarus, culminating in the priceless words, "Jesus wept".

And so by the bitter way of the Cross the grandeur of the incarnation passes into the glory of the resurrection. The last two chapters are alive with thrilling incident. If any one wishes to form a true conception of what those brief chapters contain, let him read "Jesus and the Resurrection," by the saintly Bishop of Durham (Dr. Handley Moule) and his cup of holy joy will fill to overflowing. At the empty tomb we breathe the air of the unseen kingdom, and presently we gaze enraptured on the face of the Crucified but risen and ever-living King. Mary Magdalene, standing in her broken-hearted despair, is all unconscious of the wondrous fact that holy

angels are right in front of her and standing behind her is her living Lord and Master. Slowly but surely the glad story spreads from lip to lip and heart to heart, until even the honest but stubborn Thomas is brought to his knees, crying in a burst of remorseful, adoring joy, "My Lord and my God!"

Then comes the lovely story of the fruitless all-night toil of the seven fishermen, the appearance at dawn of the Stranger on the beach, the miraculous draught of fishes, the glad cry of recognition, "It is the Lord!" the never-to-be-forgotten breakfast with the risen Saviour, and His searching interview with Peter, passing into the mystery of St. John's old age.

In all these swiftly-drawn outlines we feel ourselves instinctively in the presence of the truth. We are crowned with the Saviour's beatitude: "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed," and we are ready to yield a glad assent to the statement which closes chapter twenty: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of His disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life in His Name."

CHAPTER X

THE TESTIMONY OF CHRIST TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

BY WILLIAM CAVEN, D. D., LL. D.,
LATE PRINCIPAL OF KNOX COLLEGE, TORONTO, CANADA

Both Jews and Christians receive the Old Testament as containing a revelation from God, while the latter regard it as standing in close and vital relationship to the New Testament. Everything connected with the Old Testament has, of recent years, been subjected to the closest scrutiny—the authorship of its several books, the time when they were written, their style, their historical value, their religious and ethical teachings. Apart from the veneration with which we regard the Old Testament writings on their own account, the intimate connection which they have with the Christian Scriptures necessarily gives us the deepest interest in the conclusions which may be reached by Old Testament criticism. For us the New Testament Dispensation presupposes and grows out of the Mosaic, so the books of the New Testament touch those of the Old at every point: *In vetere testamento novum latet, et in novo vetus patet.* (In the Old Testament the New is concealed, and in the New the Old is revealed.)

We propose to take a summary view of the testimony of our Lord to the Old Testament, as it is recorded by the Evangelists. The New Testament writers themselves largely quote and refer to the Old Testament, and the views which they express regarding the old economy and its writings are in harmony with the statements of their Master; but, for various reasons, we here confine ourselves to what is related of the Lord Himself.

Let us refer, first, to what is contained or necessarily implied in the Lord's testimony to the Old Testament Scriptures, and, secondly, to the critical value of His testimony.

I. THE LORD'S TESTIMONY TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

Our Lord's authority—though this is rather the *argumentum silentio*—may be cited in favor of the Old Testament canon as accepted by the Jews in His day. He never charges them with adding to or taking from the Scriptures, or in any way tampering with the text. Had they been guilty of so great a sin it is hardly possible that among the charges brought against them, this matter should not even be alluded to. The Lord reproaches His countrymen with ignorance of the Scriptures, and with making the law void through their traditions, but He never hints that they have foisted any book into the canon, or rejected any which deserved a place in it.

Now, the Old Testament canon of the first century is the same as our own. The evidence for this is complete, and the fact is hardly questioned. The New Testament contains, indeed, no catalogue of the Old Testament books, but the testimony of Josephus, of Melito of Sardis, of Origen, of Jerome, of the Talmud, decisively shows that the Old Testament canon, once fixed, has remained unaltered. Whether the steady Jewish tradition that the canon was finally determined by Ezra and the Great Synagogue is altogether correct or not, it is certain that the Septuagint agrees with the Hebrew as to the canon, thus showing that the subject was not in dispute two centuries before Christ. Nor is the testimony of the Septuagint weakened by the fact that the common Old Testament Apocrypha are appended to the canonical books; for "of no one among the Apocryphal books is it so much as hinted, either by the author, or by any other Jewish writer, that it was worthy of a place among the sacred books" (Kitto's Cyclo., art. "Canon"). The Lord, it is observed, never quotes any of the aprocryphal books, nor refers to them.

NO PART ASSAILED

If our Lord does not name the writers of the books of the Old Testament in detail, it may at least be said that no word of His calls in question the genuineness of any book, and that he distinctly assigns several parts of Scripture to the writers whose names they pass under. The Law is ascribed to Moses; David's name is connected with the Psalms; the prophecies of Isaiah are attributed to Isaiah, and the prophecies of Daniel to Daniel. We shall afterward inquire whether these references are merely by way of accommodation, or whether more importance should be attached to them; in the meantime, we note that the Lord does not, in any instance, express dissent from the common opinion, and that, as to several parts of Scripture, He distinctly endorses it.

The references to Moses as legislator and writer are such as these: To the cleansed leper He says, "Go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded" (Matt. 8:4). "He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives" (Matt. 19:8). "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead" (Luke 16:31). " For Moses said, Honor thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death" (Mark 7:10). "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke 24:27). "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me" (Luke 24:44). "There is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me: For he wrote of Me. But if ye believed not his writings, how shall ye believe My words?" (John 5:45-47). "Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law?" (John 7:19). "Moses therefore gave unto

you circumcision. * * * If a man on the Sabbath day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken," etc. (John 7:22, 23). The omitted parenthetical words—"not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers"—seem clearly to show, it may be remarked in passing, that the Lord is not unobservant of historical exactness.

The Psalms are quoted by our Lord more than once, but only once is a writer named. The 110th Psalm is ascribed to David; and the vadidity of the Lord's argument depends on its being Davidic. The reference, therefore, so far as it goes, confirms the inscriptions of the Psalms in relation to authorship.

Isa. 6:9 is quoted thus: "In them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand" (Matt. 13:14, 15). Again, chapter 29:13 of Isaiah's prophecy is cited: "Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites. * * * This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me" (Mark 7:6). When, in the beginning of His ministry, the Lord came to Nazareth, there was delivered unto Him in the synagogue "the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor," etc. (Luke 4:17, 18). The passage read by our Lord is from the 61st chapter of Isaiah, which belongs to the section of the book very often, at present, ascribed to the second, or pseudo, Isaiah; but we do not press this point, as it may be said that the Evangelist, rather than Christ, ascribes the words to Isaiah.

In His great prophecy respecting the downfall of the Jewish state the Lord refers to "the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet:" As in Dan. 9:27, we read that "For the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate," and in chapter 12:11, that "the abomination that maketh desolate (shall) be set up."

NARRATIVES AND RECORDS AUTHENTIC

When Christ makes reference to Old Testament narratives and records, He accepts them as authentic, as historically true. He does not give or suggest in any case a mythical or allegorical interpretation. The accounts of the creation, of the flood, of the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, as well as many incidents and events of later occurrence, are taken as authentic. It may, of course, be alleged that the Lord's references to the creation of man and woman, the flood, the cities of the plain, etc., equally serve His purpose of illustration whether He regards them as historical or not. But on weighing His words it will be seen that they lose much of their force and appropriateness unless the events alluded to had a historical character.

Let us refer more particularly to this matter. When the Pharisees ask Christ whether it is lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause, He answers them: "Have ye not read, that He which made them in the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?" (Matt. 19:4, 5). Again: "As the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. For as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not, until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be" (Matt. 24:37, 39). Again: "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee" (Matt. 11:23, 24). These utterances, every one feels, lose their weight and solemnity, if there was

no flood such as is described in Genesis, and if the destruction of wicked Sodom may be only a myth. Illustrations and parallels may, for certain purposes, be adduced from fictitious literature, but when the Lord would awaken the conscience of men and alarm their fears by reference to the certainty of divine judgment, He will not confirm His teaching by instances of punishment which are only fabulous. His argument that the Holy and Just God will do as He has done—will make bare His arm as in the days of old—is robbed, in this case, of all validity.

A view frequently urged in the present day is that, as with other nations, so with the Jews, the mythical period precedes the historical, and thus the earlier narratives of the Old Testament must be taken according to their true character. In later periods of the Old Testament we have records which, on the whole, are historical; but in the very earliest times we must not look for authentic history at all. An adequate examination of this theory (which has, of course, momentous exegetical consequences) cannot here be attempted. We merely remark that our Lord's brief references to early Old Testament narrative would not suggest the distinction so often made between earlier and later Old Testament records on the score of trustworthiness.

THE OLD TESTAMENT FROM GOD

We advance to say that Christ accepts the Old Dispensation and its Scriptures as, in a special sense, from God; as having special, divine authority. Many who recognize no peculiar sacredness or authority in the religion of the Jews above other religions of the world, would readily admit that it is from God. But their contention is that all religions (especially what they are pleased to call the *great religions)* have elements of truth in them, that they all furnish *media* through which devout souls have fellowship with the Power which rules the universe, but that none of them should exalt its

pretensions much above the others, far less claim exclusive divine sanction; all of them being the product of man's spiritual nature, as molded by his history and environment, in different nations and ages. This is the view under which the study of comparative religion is prosecuted by many eminent scholars. A large and generous study of religions—their characteristics and history—tends, it is held, to bring them into closer fellowship with each other; and only ignorance or prejudice (say these unbiased thinkers) can isolate the religion of the Old Testament or of the New, and refuse to acknowledge in other religions the divine elements which entitle them to take rank with Judaism or Christianity.

The utterances of Jesus Christ on this question of the divinity of the Old Testament religion and cults are unmistakable; and not less clear and decided is His language respecting the writings in which this religion is delivered. God is the source in the directest sense, of both the religion and the records of it. No man can claim Christ's authority for classing Judaism with Confucianism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Parseeism. There is nothing, indeed, in the Lord's teaching which forbids us to recognize anything that is good in ethnic religions—any of those elements of spiritual truth which become the common property of the race and which were not completely lost in the night of heathenism; but, on the other hand, it is abundantly evident that the Jewish faith is, to our Lord, the one true faith, and that the Jewish Scriptures have a place of their own—a place which cannot be shared with the sacred books of other peoples. Samaritanism, even though it had appropriated so largely from the religion of Israel, He will not recognize. "For salvation is of the Jews."

Almost any reference of our Lord to the Old Testament will support the statement that He regards the Dispensation and its Scriptures as from God. He shows, e. g., that Old Testament prophecy is fulfilled in Himself, or He vindicates

His teaching and His claims by Scripture, or He enjoins obedience to the law (as in the case of the cleansed lepers), or He asserts the inviolability of the law till its complete fulfillment, or He accuses a blinded and self-righteous generation of superseding and vacating a law which they were bound to observe. A few instances of explicit recognition of the Old Testament Scriptures as proceeding from God and having divine authority, may be here adduced. In His Sermon on the Mount the Lord makes this strong and comprehensive statement: "Verily, I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matt. 5:18).

In the context the law is distinguished from the prophets and designates, therefore, the Pentateuch; and surely the divine origin of this part of Scripture is unquestionably implied. No such inviolability could be claimed for any merely human institution or production. When the hypocritical and heartless son pretended to devote to God what should have gone to support his indigent parents, he "made the commandment of God of none effect," "for God commanded, saying, Honor thy father and mother" (Matt. 15:4). In purging the temple the Lord justifies His action in these words: "It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer" (Matt. 21:13). Again: "As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?" (Matt. 22:32). Again: "Laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do" (Mark 7:8). So many passages of the Old Testament are quoted or alluded to by the Lord as having received, or as awaiting fulfillment, that it is scarcely necessary to make citations of this class. These all most certainly imply the divinity of Scripture; for no man, no creature, can tell what is hidden in the remote future.

We are not forgetting that the Lord fully recognizes the imperfect and provisional character of the Mosaic law and of the Old Dispensation. Were the Old faultless, no place would have been found for the New. Had grace and truth come by Moses, the advent of Jesus Christ would have been unnecessary. So when the Pharisees put the question to Christ why Moses commanded to give to a wife who has found no favor with her husband a writing of divorcement and to put her away, He replied: "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so" (Matt. 19:8). The Mosaic legislation was not in every part absolutely the best that could be given, but it was such as the divine wisdom saw best for the time being and under the special circumstances of the Hebrew people. Not only did the Old Testament set forth a typical economy, which must give place to another, but it embodied ethical elements of a provisional kind which must pass away when the incarnate Son had fully revealed the Father. The Old Testament is conscious of its own imperfections, for Jeremiah thus writes: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt." But in all this there is nothing to modify the proposition which we are illustrating, viz., that our Lord accepts the Old Testament economy and its Scriptures as from God, as stamped with divine authority, and as truly making known the divine mind and will.

Marcion and the Gnostics did not receive any part of the Old Testament Scriptures, and the Old Dispensation itself they held to be of evil origin. So decided were they against the Old Testament that they would not admit into their New Testament canon the books which especially bear witness to the Old. But the Christian Church has followed its Master

in regarding the Old Testament as the Word of God, as the Bible of the ages before the Advent, and as still part of the Bible for the Christian Church. Not until the days of developed rationalism was this position called in question, except among unbelievers. But it is obvious that the style of criticism which, in our own time, is frequently applied to the Old Testament (not to say anything about the New), touching its histories, its laws, its morality, is quite inconsistent with the recognition of any special divine characteristics or authority as belonging to it. The very maxim so often repeated, that criticism must deal with these writings precisely as it deals with other writings is a refusal to Scripture, *in limine,* of the peculiar character which it claims, and which the Church has ever recognized in it. If a special divine authority can be vindicated for these books, or for any of them, this fact, it is clear, ought to be taken into account by the linguistic and historical critic. Logically, we should begin our study of them by investigating their title to such authority, and, should their claim prove well founded, it should never be forgotten in the subsequent critical processes. The establishment of this high claim will imply in these writings moral characteristics (not to mention others) which should exempt them from a *certain suspicion* which the critic may not unwarrantably allow to be present when he begins to examine documents of an ordinary kind. It is not, therefore, correct to say that criticism, in commencing its inquiries, should know nothing of the alleged divine origin or sacred character of a book. If the book has no good vouchers for its claims to possess a sacred character, criticism must proceed unhindered; but correct conceptions of critical methods demand that every important fact already ascertained as to any writings should be kept faithfully before the mind in the examination of them. Science must here unite with reverential feeling in requiring right treatment of a book which claims special divine sanction, and is willing

to have its claims duly investigated. The examination of a witness of established veracity and rectitude would not be conducted in precisely the same manner as that of a witness whose character is unknown or under suspicion. Wellhausen's style of treating the history of Israel can have no justification unless he should first show that the claim so often advanced in "Thus saith the Lord" is entirely baseless. So far from admitting the validity of the axiom referred to, we distinctly hold that it is unscientific. A just and true criticism must have respect to everything already known and settled regarding the productions to which it is applied, and assuredly so momentous a claim as that of divine authority demands careful preliminary examination.

But criticism, it may be urged, is the very instrument by which we must test the pretensions of these writings to a special divine origin and character, and, hence, it cannot stand aside till this question has been considered. In requiring criticism to be silent till the verdict has been rendered, we are putting it under restrictions inconsistent with its functions and prerogatives. The reply, however, is that the principal external and internal evidences for the divine origin of the Scriptures can be weighed with sufficient accuracy to determine the general character and authority of these writings before criticism, either higher or lower, requires to apply its hand. "The heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellences, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evince itself to be the word of God" (Conf. of Faith I:5). But all of these considerations can, in all that is material, be weighed and estimated before technical criticism begins its labors, as they have been estimated to the entire conviction of the divinity of Scripture on the part of thousands who had

no acquaintance with criticism. Should the fair application of criticism, when its proper time comes, tend to beget doubt as to the general conclusion already reached regarding the Bible, it will doubtless be right to review carefully the evidence on which our conclusion depends; but the substantive and direct proofs of the Scriptures being from God should first be handled, and the decision arrived at should be kept in mind, while criticism is occupied with its proper task. This seems to us the true order of the procedure.

GOD SPEAKS

Our Lord certainly attributes to the Old Testament a far higher character than many have supposed. God speaks in it throughout; and while He will more perfectly reveal Himself in His Son, not anything contained in the older revelation shall fail of its end or be convicted of error. Christ does not use the term "inspiration" in speaking of the Old Testament, but when we have adduced His words regarding the origin and authority of these writings, it will be evident that to Him they are God-given in every part. It will be seen that His testimony falls not behind that of His Apostles who say: "Every Scripture inspired of God" (2 Tim. 3:16), and "The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. 1:21).

WORDS AND COMMANDS OF GOD

In speaking of Christ as teaching that the Old Testament is from God we have referred to passages in which He says that its words and commands are the words and commands of God; e. g., "God commanded, saying, Honor thy father and thy mother: and He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death" (Matt. 15:4). Again: "Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?"

In a comprehensive way the laws of the Pentateuch, or of the Old Testament, are called "the commandments of God." "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men. * * * Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition" (Mark 7:8, 9); and in the context of this last quotation the commandment of God is identified with what "Moses spake," showing that the words of Moses are also the words of God.

Passages like these do more than prove that the Old Testament Scriptures express *on the whole* the mind of God, and, therefore, possess very high authority. If it can certainly be said that God spake certain words, or that certain words and commandments are the words and commandments of God, we have more than a general endorsement; as when, e. g., the editor of a periodical states that he is responsible for the general character and tendency of articles which he admits, but not for every sentiment or expression of opinion contained in them.

It needs, of course, no proof that the words quoted in the New Testament as spoken by God are not the only parts of the Old which have direct divine authority. The same thing might evidently be said of other parts of the book. The impression left, we think, on every unprejudiced mind is that such quotations as the Lord made are only specimens of a book in which God speaks throughout. There is not encouragement certainly to attempt any analysis of Scripture into its divine and its human parts or elements—to apportion the authorship between God and the human penman, for, as we have seen, the same words are ascribed to God and to His servant Moses. The whole is spoken by God and by Moses also. All is divine and at the same time all is human. The divine and the human are so related that separation is impossible.

ABSOLUTE INFALLIBILITY OF SCRIPTURE

Attention may be specially called to three passages in which the Lord refers to the origin and the absolute infallibility of Scripture. Jesus asked the Pharisees, "What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He? They say unto Him, The Son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David *in spirit* call Him Lord?" The reference is to Psalm 110, which the Lord says David spake or wrote "in spirit;" i. e., David was completely under the Spirit's influence in the production of the Psalm, so that when he calls the Messiah his "Lord" the word has absolute authority. Such is clearly the Lord's meaning, and the Pharisees have no reply to His argument. The Lord does not say that the entire Old Testament was written "in the Spirit," nor even that all the Psalms were so produced; He makes no direct statement of this nature; yet the plain reader would certainly regard this as implied. His hearers understood their Scriptures to have been all written by immediate inspiration of God, and to be the word of God; and He merely refers to Psalm 110 as having the character which belonged to Scripture at large.

In John 10:34-36 Christ vindicates Himself from the charge of blasphemy in claiming to be the Son of God: "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods. If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of Him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" The Scripture cannot be broken—*ou dunatai luthēnai.* The verb signifies to loose, unbind, dissolve, and as applied to Scripture means to subvert or deprive of authority. The authority of Scripture is then so complete—so pervasive—as to extend to its individual terms. "*Gods*" is the proper word because it is used to designate the Jewish rulers. If this is not verbal inspiration, it comes very near it. One

may, of course, allege that the Lord's statement of inerrancy implies only that the principal words of Scripture must be taken precisely as they are, but that He does not claim the like authority for all its words. Without arguing this point, we merely say that it is not certain or obvious that the way is left open for this distinction. In face of Christ's utterances it devolves on those who hold that inspiration extends to the thought of Scripture only, but not to the words, or to the leading words but not to the words in general, to adduce very cogent arguments in support of their position. The *onus probandi,* it seems to us, is here made to rest on them. The theory that inspiration may be affirmed only of the main views or positions of Scripture, but neither of the words nor of the development of the thoughts, cannot, it seems clear, be harmonized with the Lord's teaching. Before adverting to a third text we may be allowed to set down these words of Augustine in writing to Jerome: "For I acknowledge with high esteem for thee, I have learned to ascribe such reverence and honor to those books of the Scriptures alone, which are now called canonical, that I believe most firmly that not one of their authors has made a mistake in writing them. And should I light upon anything in those writings, which may seem opposed to truth, I shall contend for nothing else, than either that the manuscript was full of errors, or that the translator had not comprehended what was said, or that I had not understood it in the least degree."

In His sermon on the Mount our Lord thus refers to His own relation to the Old Testament economy and its Scriptures: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matt. 5:17, 18). No stronger words could be employed to affirm the divine authority of every part of the Old Testament; for the law and the prophets mean the entire Old

Testament Scriptures. If this declaration contemplates the *moral* element of these Scriptures, it means that no part of them shall be set aside by the New Dispensation, but "fulfilled"—i. e., filled up and completed by Jesus Christ as a sketch is filled up and completed by the painter. If, as others naturally interpret, the *typical* features of the Old Testament are included in the statement, the term "fulfilled," as regards this element, will be taken in the more usual meaning. In either case the inviolability and, by implication, the divine origin of the Old Testament could not be more impressively declared. Mark how comprehensive and absolute the words are: "One jot or one tittle." "Jot" (iōta) is *yod,* the smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet; "tittle," literally little horn or apex, designates the little lines or projections by which Hebrew letters, similar in other respects, differ from each other. We have here, one might say, the inspiration of *letters* of the Old Testament. Everything contained in it has divine authority, and must, therefore, be divine in origin; for it is unnecessary to show that no such authority could be ascribed to writings merely human, or to writings in which the divine and the human interests could be separated analytically.

Should it be said that the "law," every jot and tittle of which must be fulfilled, means here the economy itself, the ordinances of Judaism, but not the record of them in writing, the reply is that we know nothing of these ordinances except through the record, so that what is affirmed must apply to the Scriptures as well as to the Dispensation.

The only questions which can be well raised are, first, whether the "law and the prophets" designate the entire Scriptures or two great divisions of them only; and, secondly, whether the words of Jesus can be taken at their full meaning, or, for some reason or other, must be discounted. The first question it is hardly worth while to discuss, for, if neither jot nor tittle of the "law and the prophets" shall fail,

it will hardly be contended that the Psalms, or whatever parts of the Old Testament are not included, have a less stable character. The latter question, of momentous import, we shall consider presently.

FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY

The inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures is clearly implied in the many declarations of our Lord respecting the fulfilment of prophecies contained in them. It is God's prerogative to know, and to make known, the future. Human presage cannot go beyond what is foreshadowed in events which have transpired, or is wrapped up in causes which we plainly see in operation. If, therefore, the Old Testament reveals, hundreds of years in advance, what is coming to pass, omniscience must have directed the pen of the writer; i. e., these Scriptures, or at least their predictive parts, must be inspired.

The passage already quoted from the Sermon on the Mount may be noticed as regards its bearing on prophecy: "I am not come to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil." While *plērōsai,* as referring to the *law,* has the special meaning above pointed out; as referring to the *prophets,* it has its more common import. We have here, then, a general statement as to the Old Testament containing prophecies which were fulfilled by Christ and in Him. Here are examples. The rejection of Messiah by the Jewish authorities, as well as the ultimate triumph of His cause, is announced in the 118th Psalm, in words which Christ applies to Himself: "The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner." The desertion of Jesus by His disciples when He was apprehended fulfils the prediction of Zechariah: "I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall all be scattered" (Matt. 26:31). Should angelic intervention rescue Jesus from death, "how then should the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" All that related to His

betrayal, apprehension, and death took place, "that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled" (Matt. 26:56). "Had ye believed Moses," said our Lord, "ye would have believed Me, for he wrote of Me" (John 5:46). The 41st Psalm preannounces the treachery of Judas in these words: "He that eateth bread with Me hath lifted up his heel against Me;" and the defection of the son of perdition takes place, "that the Scriptures may be fulfilled" (John 17:12). The persistent and malignant opposition of His enemies fulfils that which is written: "They hated Me without a cause" (John 15:25). Finally, in discoursing to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, the Lord, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself. "And He said unto them: These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning Me. Then opened He their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day" (Luke 24:44-46).

It is not denied that in some instances the word "fulfil" is used in the New Testament merely as signifying that some event or condition of things corresponds with or realizes something that is written in the Old Testament; as when the words in Isaiah, "By hearing ye shall hear and shall not understand," are said to be fulfilled in the blind obduracy of the Pharisees. Nor, again, is it denied that "fulfil" has the meaning of filling, or expanding, or completing. But clearly our Lord, in the passages here cited, employs the term in another acceptation. He means nothing less than this: that the Scriptures which He says were "fulfilled" were intended by the Spirit of God to have the very application which He makes of them; they were predictions in the sense ordinarily meant by that term. If the Messiah of the Old Testament

were merely an ideal personage, there would be little force in saying that the Lord "opened the understanding" of the disciples that they might see His death and resurrection to be set forth in the prophecies. But to teach that the Old Testament contains authentic predictions is, as we have said, to teach that it is inspired. The challenge to heathen deities is, "Show the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods" (Isa. 41:23).

We thus find that our Lord recognizes the same Old Testament canon as we have, that so far as He makes reference to particular books of the canon He ascribes them to the writers whose names they bear, that He regards the Jewish religion and its sacred books as in a special sense—a sense not to be affirmed of any other religion—from God, that the writers of Scripture, in His view, spake in the Spirit, that their words are so properly chosen that an argument may rest on the exactness of a term, that no part of Scripture shall fail of its end or be convicted of error, and that the predictions of Scripture are genuine predictions, which must all in their time receive fulfilment.

We cannot here discuss the doctrine of inspiration; but on the ground of the Lord's testimony to the Old Testament, as above summarized, we may surely affirm that He claims for it throughout all that is meant by inspiration when we use that term in the most definite sense. No higher authority could well be ascribed to apostolic teaching, or to any part of the New Testament Scriptures, than the Lord attributes to the more ancient Scriptures when He declares that "jot or tittle shall not pass from them till all be fulfilled," and that if men "hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead" (Luke 16:31).

II. THE VALUE OF CHRIST'S TESTIMONY

It remains that we should briefly advert to the value, for the scientific student of the Bible, of Christ's testimony to

the Old Testament. The very announcement of such a topic may not be heard without pain, but in view of theories with which Biblical students are familiar, it becomes necessary to look into the question. Can we, then, accept the utterances of Christ on the matters referred to as having value—as of authority—in relation to the Biblical scholarship? Can we take them at their face value, or must they be discounted? Or again, are these words of Jesus valid for criticism on some questions, but not on others?

There are two ways in which it is sought to invalidate Christ's testimony to the Old Testament.

1. IGNORANCE OF JESUS ALLEGED

It is alleged that Jesus had no knowledge beyond that of His contemporaries as to the origin and literary characteristics of the Scriptures. The Jews believed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, that the narratives of the Old Testament are all authentic history, and that the words of Scripture are all inspired. Christ shared the opinions of His countrymen on these topics, even when they were in error. To hold this view, it is maintained, does not detract from the Lord's qualifications for His proper work, which was religious and spiritual, not literary; for in relation to the religious value of the Old Testament and its spiritual uses and applications He may confidently be accepted as our guide. His knowledge was adequate to the delivery of the doctrines of His kingdom, but did not necessarily extend to questions of scholarship and criticism. Of these He speaks as any other man; and to seek to arrest, or direct, criticism by appeal to His authority, is procedure which can only recoil upon those who adopt it. This view is advanced, not only by critics who reject the divinity of Christ, but by many who profess to believe that doctrine. In the preface to his first volume on the Pentateuch and Joshua, Colenso thus writes: "It is perfectly consistent with the most entire and sincere belief in our

Lord's divinity to hold, as many do, that when He vouchsafed to become a 'Son of man' He took our nature fully, and voluntarily entered into all the conditions of humanity, and, among others, into that which makes our growth in all ordinary knowledge gradual and limited. * * * It is not supposed that, in His human nature, He was acquainted more than any Jew of His age with the mysteries of all modern sciences, nor * * * can it be seriously maintained that, as an infant or young child, He possessed a knowledge surpassing that of the most pious and learned adults of His nation, upon the subject of the authorship and age of the different portions of the Pentateuch. At what period, then, of His life on earth, is it to be supposed that He had granted to Him as the Son of man, supernaturally, full and accurate information on these points?" etc. (vol. i., p. 32). "It should also be observed," says Dr. S. Davidson, "that historical and critical questions could only belong to His human culture, a culture stamped with the characteristics of His age and country."

The doctrine of the Kenosis is invoked to explain the imperfection of our Lord's knowledge on critical questions, as evidenced by the way in which He speaks of the Pentateuch and of various Old Testament problems. The general subject of the limitation of Christ's knowledge during His life on earth is, of course, a very difficult one, but we do not need here to consider it. The Gospel of Mark does speak of the day and hour when the heaven and earth shall pass away as being known to the Father only, and not to the Son; but without venturing any opinion on a subject so mysterious, we may, at least, affirm that the Lord's knowledge was entirely adequate to the perfect discharge of His prophetical office. To impute imperfection to Him as the Teacher of the Church were indeed impious. Now the case stands thus: By a certain class of critics we are assured that, in the interests of truth, in order to an apologetic such as the

present time absolutely requires, the traditional opinions regarding the authorship of the Old Testament books and the degree of authority which attaches to several, if not all of them, must be revised. In order to save the ship, we must throw overboard this cumbrous and antiquated tackling. Much more, we are assured, than points of scholarship are involved; for intelligent and truth-loving men cannot retain their confidence in the Bible and its religion, unless we discard the opinions which have prevailed as to the Old Testament, even though these opinions can apparently plead in their favor the authority of Jesus Christ.

Now mark the position in which the Lord, as our Teacher, is thus placed. We have followed Him in holding opinions which turn out to be unscientific, untrue; and so necessary is it to relinquish these opinions that neither the Jewish nor the Christian faith can be satisfactorily defended if we cling to them. Is it not, therefore, quite clear that the Lord's teaching is, in something material, found in error—that His prophetical office is assailed? For the allegation is that, in holding fast to what He is freely allowed to have taught, we are imperiling the interests of religion. The critics whom we have in view must admit either that the points in question are of no importance, or that the Lord was imperfectly qualified for His prophetical work. Those who have reverence for the Bible will not admit either position. For why should scholarship so magnify the necessity to apologetics of correcting the traditional opinion as to the age and authorship of the Pentateuch, and other questions of Old Testament criticism, unless it means to show that the Old Testament requires more exact, more enlightened, handling than the Lord gave it? Should it be replied that the Lord, had He been on earth *now,* would have spoken otherwise on the topics concerned, the obvious answer is, that the Lord's teaching is for all ages, and that His word "cannot be broken."

2. THEORY OF ACCOMMODATION

The theory of accommodation is brought forward in explanation of those references of Christ to the Old Testament which endorse what are regarded as inaccuracies or popular errors. He spake, it is said, regarding the Old Testament, after the current opinion or belief. This belief would be sometimes right and sometimes wrong; but where no interest of religion or morality was affected—where spiritual truth was not involved—He allowed Himself, even where the common belief was erroneous, to speak in accordance with it. Some extend the principle of accommodation to the *interpretation* of the Old Testament as well as to questions of canon and authorship; and in following it the Lord is declared to have acted prudently, for no good end could have been served, it is alleged, by crossing the vulgar opinion upon matters of little importance, and thus awakening or strengthening suspicion as to His teaching in general.

As to the accommodation thus supposed to have been practiced by our Lord, we observe that if it implies, as the propriety of the term requires, a more accurate knowledge on His part than His language reveals, it becomes difficult, in many instances, to vindicate His perfect integrity. In some cases where accommodation is alleged, it might, indeed, be innocent enough, but in others it would be inconsistent with due regard to truth; and most of the statements of the Lord touching the Old Testament to which attention has been directed in this discussion seem to be of this latter kind. Davidson himself says: "Agreeing as we do in the sentiment that our Savior and His Apostles accommodated their mode of reasoning to the habitual notions of the Jews, no authority can be attributed to that reasoning *except when it takes the form of an independent declaration or statement,* and so rests on the speaker's credit." Now the statements of Christ respecting the Old Testament Scriptures

to which we desire specially to direct attention are precisely of this nature. Are not these "independent declarations"? "One jot or one tittle shall not pass," etc.; "The Scripture cannot be broken;" "David in spirit calls him Lord;" "All things must be fulfilled which are written in the Law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning Me."

Further, we may say as before, that if our Lord's statements—His *obiter dicta,* if you will—about the authorship of parts of Scripture give a measure of countenance to opinions which are standing in the way of both genuine scholarship and of faith, it is hard to see how they can be regarded as instances of a justifiable accommodation. It seems to us (may we reverently use the words) that in this case you cannot vindicate the Lord's absolute truthfulness except by imputing to Him a degree of ignorance which would unfit Him for His office as permanent Teacher of the Church. Here is the dilemma for the radical critic—either he is agitating the Church about trifles, or, if his views have the apologetical importance which he usually attributes to them, he is censuring the Lord's discharge of His prophetic office; for the allegation is that Christ's words prove perplexing and misleading in regard to weighty issues which the progress of knowledge has obliged us to face. Surely we should be apprehensive of danger if we discover that views which claim our adhesion, on any grounds whatever, tend to depreciate the wisdom of Him whom we call "Lord and Master," upon whom the Spirit was bestowed "without measure," and who "spake as never man spake." It is a great thing in this controversy to have the Lord on our side.

Are, then, the Lord's references to Moses and the law to be regarded as evidence that He believed the Pentateuch to be written by Moses, or should they be classed as instances of accommodation? When we take *in cumulo* all the passages in which the legislation of the Pentateuch and the

writing of it are connected with Moses, a very strong case is made out against mere accommodation. The obvious accuracy of speech observed in some of these references cannot be overlooked; e. g., "Moses, therefore, gave you circumcision *(not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers)*." Again, "There is one that accuseth you, even Moses in whom ye trust; for had ye believed Moses ye would have believed Me, for he wrote of Me; but if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My words?" This is not the style of one who does not wish his words to be taken strictly!

TWO POSITIONS CLEAR

Two positions may, I think, be affirmed: 1. The legislation of the Pentateuch is actually ascribed to Moses by the Lord. If this legislation is, in the main, long subsequent to Moses, and a good deal of it later than the exile, the Lord's language is positively misleading, and endorses an error which vitiates the entire construction of Old Testament history and the development of religion in Israel. 2. Moses is to such extent the writer of the law that it may, with propriety, be spoken of as "his writings." All admit that there are passages in the Books of Moses which were written by another hand or other hands, and should even additions other than certain brief explanatory interpolations and the last chapter of Deuteronomy have to be recognized (which has not yet been demonstrated) the Pentateuch would remain Mosaic. Should Moses have dictated much of his writings, as Paul did, they would, it is unnecessary to say, be not the less his. The words of Jesus we consider as evidence that He regarded Moses as, substantially, the writer of the books which bear his name. Less than this robs several of our Lord's statements of their point and propriety.

It is hardly necessary to say that we have no desire to see a true and reverent criticism of the Old Testament, and of the New as well, arrested in its progress, or in the least hin-

dered. Criticism must accomplish its task, and every lover of truth is more than willing that it should do so. Reluctance to see truth fully investigated, fully ascertained and established, in any department of thought and inquiry, and most of all in those departments which are highest, is lamentable evidence of moral weakness, of imperfect confidence in Him who is the God of truth. But criticism must proceed by legitimate methods and in a true spirit. It must steadfastly keep before it all the facts essential to be taken into account. In the case of its application to the Bible and religion, it is most reasonable to demand that full weight should be allowed to all the teachings, all the words of Him who only knows the Father, and who came to reveal Him to the world, and who is Himself the Truth. If all Scripture bears testimony to Christ, we cannot refuse to hear Him when He speaks of its characteristics. It is folly, it is unutterable impiety, to decide differently from the Lord any question regarding the Bible on which we have His verdict; nor does it improve the case to say that we shall listen to Him when He speaks of spiritual truth, but shall count ourselves free when the question is one of scholarship. Alas for our scholarship when it brings us into controversy with Him who is the Prophet, as He is the Priest and King of the Church, and by whose Spirit both Prophets and Apostles spake!

Nothing has been said in this paper respecting the proper method of *interpreting* the different books and parts of the Old Testament, nor the way of dealing with specific difficulties.

Our object has been to show that the Lord regards the entire book, or collection of books, as divine, authoritative, infallible. But in the wide variety of these writings there are many forms of composition, and every part, it is obvious to say, must be understood and explained in accordance with the rules of interpretation which apply to literature of its kind. We have not been trying in advance to bind up the interpreter to an unintelligent literalism in exegesis, which

should take no account of what is peculiar to different species of writing, treating poetry and prose, history and allegory, the symbolical and the literal, as if all were the same. The consideration of this most important subject of interpretation with which apologetical interests are, indeed, closely connected, has not been before us. But nothing which we could be called upon to advance regarding the interpretation of the Old Testament could modify the results here reached in relation to the subject of which we have spoken. Our Lord's testimony to the character of the Old Testament must remain unimpaired.

CHAPTER XI

THE EARLY NARRATIVES OF GENESIS

BY PROFESSOR JAMES ORR, D. D.,

UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW, SCOTLAND

By the early narratives of Genesis are to be understood the first eleven chapters of the book—those which precede the times of Abraham. These chapters present peculiarities of their own, and I confine attention to them, although the critical treatment applied to them is not confined to these chapters, but extends throughout the whole Book of Genesis, the Book of Exodus, and the later history with much the same result in reducing them to legend.

We may begin by looking at the matter covered by these eleven chapters with which we have to deal. See what they contain. First, we have the sublime proëm to the Book of Genesis, and to the Bible as a whole, in the account of the Creation in Gen. 1. However it got there, this chapter manifestly stands in its fit place as the introduction to all that follows. Where is there anything like it in all literature? There is nothing anywhere, in Babylonian legend or anywhere else. You ask perhaps what interest has religious faith in the doctrine of creation—in any theory or speculation on how the world came to be? I answer, it has the very deepest interest. The interest of religion in the doctrine of creation is that this doctrine is our guarantee for the dependence of all things on God—the ground of our assurance that everything in nature and Providence is at His disposal. "My help cometh from the Lord which made heaven and earth." Suppose there was anything in the universe that was not created by God—that existed independently of Him—how could we be sure that that element might not thwart, defeat, destroy the ful-

fillment of God's purposes? The Biblical doctrine of creation forever excludes that supposition.

Following on this primary account of creation is a second narrative in a different style—from chapter 2 to 4—but closely connected with the first by the words, "In the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven." This is sometimes spoken of as a second narrative of creation, and is often said to contradict the first. But this is a mistake. As the critic Dillmann points out, this second narrative is not a history of creation in the sense of the first at all. It has nothing to say of the creation of either heaven or earth, of the heavenly bodies, of the general world of vegetation. It deals simply with man and God's dealings with man when first created, and everything in the narrative is regarded and grouped from this point of view. The heart of the narrative is the story of the temptation and the fall of man. It is sometimes said that the Fall is not alluded to in later Old Testament Scripture, and therefore cannot be regarded as an essential part of revelation. It would be truer to say that the story of the Fall, standing there at the commencement of the Bible, furnishes the key to all that follows. What is the picture given in the whole Bible—Old Testament and New? Is it not that of a world turned aside from God—living in rebellion and defiance to Him—disobedient to His calls and resisting His grace? What is the explanation of this universal apostasy and transgression if it is not that man has fallen from his first estate? For certainly this is not the state in which God made man, or wishes him to be. The truth is, if this story of the Fall were not there at the beginning of the Bible, we would require to put it there for ourselves in order to explain the moral state of the world as the Bible pictures it to us, and as we know it to be. In chapter 4, as an appendage to these narratives, there follows the story of Cain and Abel, with brief notices of the beginning of civilization in the line of Cain, and of the start of a holier line in Seth.

Next, returning to the style of Gen. 1—what is called the "Elohistic" style—we have the genealogical line of Seth extending from Adam to Noah. You are struck with the longevity ascribed to those patriarchal figures in the dawn of time, but not less with the constant mournful refrain which ends each notice, Enoch's alone excepted, "and he died." This chapter connects directly with the account of creation in Genesis 1, but presupposes equally the narrative of the Fall in the intervening chapters. We often read in critical books assertions to the contrary of this. The "priestly writer," we are told, "knows nothing" of a Fall. But that is not so. Wellhausen, that master-critic, is on my side here. Speaking of the so-called "priestly" sections in the story of the flood, he says, "The flood is well led up to; in Q. [that is his name for the priestly writing] we should be inclined to ask in surprise how the earth has come all at once to be so corrupted after being in the best of order. Did we not know it from J. E.? [that is, the Fall Narrative]." Another leading critical authority, Dr. Carpenter, writes in the same strain.

Then you come to the flood story in Gen. 6:9, in which two narratives are held to be interblended. There are two writers here, criticism says—the Elohistic and the Jehovistic,—yet criticism must own that these two stories fit wonderfully into one another, and the one is incomplete without the other. If one, for instance, gives the command to Noah and his house to enter the Ark, it is the other that narrates the building of the Ark. If one tells of Noah's "house," it is the other that gives the names of Noah's sons. What is still more striking, when you compare these Bible stories with the Babylonian story of the deluge, you find that it takes both of these so-called "narratives" in Genesis to make up the one complete story of the tablets. Then, following on the flood and the covenant with Noah, the race of mankind spreads out again as depicted in the table of nations in chapter 10. In verse 25 it is noted that in the

days of Peleg was the earth divided; then in chapter 11 you have the story of the divine judgment at Babel confusing human speech, and this is followed by a new genealogy extending to Abraham.

Such is a brief survey of the material, and on the face of it it must be acknowledged that this is a wonderfully well-knit piece of history of its own kind which we have before us, not in the least resembling the loose, incoherent, confused mythologies of other nations. There is nothing resembling it in any other history or religious book, and when we come to speak of the great ideas which pervade it, and give it its unity, our wonder is still increased.

Ah, yes, our critical friends will tell us, the great ideas are there, but they were not originally there. They were put in later by the prophets. The prophets took the old legends and put these grand ideas into them, and made them religiously profitable. If that was the way in which God chose to give us His revelation, we would be bound gratefully to accept it, but I must be pardoned if I prefer to believe that the great ideas did not need to be put into these narratives; that they were there in the things themselves from the very first.

The truth is, a great deal here depends on your method of approach to these old narratives. There is a saying, "Everything can be laid hold of by two handles," and that is true of these ancient stories. Approach them in one way and you make them out to be a bundle of fables, legends, myths, without historical basis of any kind. Then wonderful feats can be performed in the handling of the myths. Prof. Gunkel, for example, that very capable Old Testament scholar, is not content with the analysis of books and chapters and verses, but adds to it the analysis of personalities. He will show you, for instance, that Cain is composed originally out of three distinct figures, blended together, Noah out of another three, and so on. I have ventured to describe Gun-

kel's theory as the explanation of the patriarchal history on the ancient principle of a fortuitous concourse of atoms. Only that does not quite answer to the kind of history we have in these narratives, which stand in such organic connection with the rest of revelation. Approach these narratives in another way and they are the oldest and most precious traditions of our race; worthy in their intrinsic merit of standing where they do at the commencement of the Word of God, and capable of vindicating their right to be there; not merely vehicles of great ideas, but presenting in their own archaic way—for archaic they are in form—the memory of great historic truths. The story of the Fall, for example, is not a myth, but enshrines the shuddering memory of an actual moral catastrophe in the beginning of our race, which brought death into the world and all our woe.

Coming now to deal a little more closely with these narratives, I suppose I ought to say something on the critical aspect of the question. But this I must pass over briefly, for I want to get to more important matters. In two points only I would desire to indicate my decided break with current critical theory. The one is the carrying down of the whole Levitical system and history connected with it to the post-exilian age. That, I believe, is not a sound result of criticism, but one which in a very short time will have to be abandoned, as indeed it is already being abandoned or greatly modified in influential quarters. This applies specially to the date of Gen. 1. Professor Delitzsh, a commentator often cited as having come round practically to the newer critical view, takes a firm stand here. In his new commentary on Gen. 1, he tells us: "The essential matters in the account of the creation are among the most ancient foundations of the religion of Israel—there are no marks of style which constrain us to relegate the Elohistic account of the creation to the exile—it is in any case a tradition reaching back to the Mosaic period."

The other point on which I dissent is the idea that the Israelites began their religious history without the idea of the one true God, Maker of heaven and earth; that they began with a tribal god, the storm god of Sinai or some other local deity, and gradually clothed him from their own minds with the attributes which belong to Jehovah. This, which is the product of the evolutionary theory of religion, and not a fair deduction from any evidence we possess, I entirely disbelieve, and I am glad to say that this view also is being greatly modified or parted with. It is this theory, however, which lies behind a great deal of the criticism of these early narratives of Genesis. Those things, it is said, could not be; those great ideas could not be there; for man at that early stage could not have evolved them. Even God, it appears, could not have given them to him. Our "could be's," however, will have to be ruled by facts, and my contention is that the facts are adverse to the theory as currently set forth.

I come now to the question, Is there any external corroboration or confirmation of these early narratives in Genesis? Here let me say a little of the relation of these narratives to Babylonia. Everyone has heard something of the wonderful discoveries in Babylonia, and it would be difficult to exaggerate the brillance and importance of these marvelous discoveries. The point which concerns us chiefly is the extraordinary light thrown on the high culture of early Babylonia. Here, long before the time of Abraham, we find ourselves in the midst of cities, arts, letters, books, libraries, and Abraham's own age—that of Hammurabi—was the bloomtime of this civilization. Instead of Israel being a people just emerging from the dim dawn of barbarism, we find in the light of these discoveries that it was a people on whom from its own standpoint the ends of the earth had come—heir to the riches of a civilization extending millenniums into the past. If you say this creates a difficulty in representing the chronology

(I may touch on this later), I answer that it gives much greater help by showing how the knowledge of very ancient things could be safely handed down. For us the chief interest of these discoveries is the help they give us in answering the question, How far do these narratives in Genesis embody for us the oldest traditions of our race? There are two reasons which lead us to look with some confidence to Babylonia for the answer to this question. For one thing, in early Babylonia we are already far back into the times to which many of these traditions relate; for another, the Bible itself points to Babylonia as the original city of those traditions. Eden was in Babylonia, as shown by its rivers, the Euphrates and Tigris. It was in Babylonia the Ark was built; and on a mountain in the neighborhood of Babylonia the Ark rested. It was from the plain of Shinar, in Babylonia, that the new distribution of the race took place. To Babylonia, therefore, if anywhere, we are entitled to look for light on these ancient traditions, and do we not find it? I read sometimes with astonishment of the statement that Babylonian discovery has done little or nothing for the confirmation of these old parts of Genesis—has rather proved that they belong to the region of the mythical.

Take only one or two examples. I leave over meanwhile the Babylonian story of the creation and the flood, and take that old tenth chapter of Genesis, the "Table of Nations." Professor Kautzsch, of Halle, a critic of note, says of that old table, "The so-called Table of Nations remains, according to all results of monumental exploration, an ethnographic original document of the first rank which nothing can replace." In this tenth chapter of Genesis, verses 8-10, we have certain statements about the origin of Babylonian civilization. We learn (1) that Babylonia is the oldest of civilizations; (2) that Assyrian civilization was derived from Babylonia; and (3) strangest of all, that the founders of Babylonian civilization were not Semites, but Hamites—descendants of

Cush. Each of these statements was in contradition to old classical notices and to what was currently believed till recently about those ancient people. Yet it will not be disputed that exploration has justified the Bible on each of these points. Assyria, undoubtedly, was younger than Babylonia; it derived its civilization, arts, religion, institutions, all that it had, from Babylonia. Strangest of all, the originators of Babylonia civilization, the Accadians, or Sumerians, were a people not of Semitic, but apparently of Turanian or what the Bible would call Hamitic stock. Take another instance; in verse 22 Elam appears as the son of Shem, but here was a difficulty. The Elamites of history were not a Semitic, but an Aryan people, and their language was Aryan. Even Professor Hommel, in defending the ancient Hebrew tradition, thought he had to admit an error here. But was there? A French expedition went out to excavate Susa, the capital of Elam, and below the ruins of the historical Elam discovered bricks and other remains of an older civilization, with Babylonian inscriptions showing the people to be of Semitic stock; so Elam was, after all, the son of Shem. In the story of the Tower of Babel in chapter 11, again is it not interesting to find the Bible deriving all the streams of mankind from the Plain of Shinar, and to find archaeology bringing corroborative proof that probably all the greater streams of civilization do take their origin from this region? For that is the view to which the opinions of scholars now tend.

Glance now at the stories of Creation, of Paradise, and of the Deluge. The story of Paradise and the Fall we may dismiss in this connection, for except in the case of the picture on an ancient seal which does bear some relation to the story of the temptation in Eden, there has yet been no proper parallel to the Bible story of the fall. On the other hand, from the ruins of Assyrian libraries have been disinterred fragments of an account of creation, and the Babylonian version of the story of the deluge, both of which have been

brought into comparison with the narratives of the Bible. Little need be said of the Babylonian creation story. It is a debased, polytheistic, long-drawn-out, mythical affair, without order, only here and there suggesting analogies to the divine works in Genesis. The flood story has much more resemblance, but it too is debased and mythical, and lacks wholly in the higher ideas which give its character to the Biblical account. Yet this is the quarry from which our critical friends would have us derive the narratives in the Bible. The Israelites borrowed them, it is thought, and purified these confused polytheistic legends and made them the vehicles of nobler teaching. We need not discuss the time and manner of this borrowing, for I cannot see my way to accept this version of events at all. There is not only no proof that these stories were borrowed in their crude form from the Babylonians, but the contrast in spirit and character between the Babylonians' products and the Bible's seems to me to forbid any such derivation. The debased form may conceivably arise from corruption of the higher, but not vice versa. Much rather may we hold with scholars like Delitzsch and Kittel, that the relation is one of cognateness, not of derivation. These traditions came down from a much older source, and are preserved by the Hebrews in their purer form. This appears to me to explain the phenomena as no theory of derivation can do, and it is in accordance with the Bible's own representation of the line of revelation from the beginning along which the sacred tradition can be transmitted.

Leaving Babylonia, I must now say a few words on the scientific and historical aspects of these narratives. Science is invoked to prove that the narratives of creation in Genesis 1, the story of man's origin and fall in chapters 2 and 3, the account of patriarchal longevity in chapters 5 and 11, the story of the deluge, and other matters, must all be rejected because in patent contradiction to the facts of modern knowledge. I would ask you, however, to suspend judgment until

we have looked at the relation in which these two things, science and the Bible, stand to each other. When science is said to contradict the Bible, I should like to ask first, What is meant by contradiction here? The Bible was never given us in order to anticipate or forestall the discoveries of modern twentieth century science. The Bible, as every sensible interpreter of Scripture has always held, takes the world as it is, not as it is seen through the eyes of twentieth century specialists, but as it lies spread out before the eyes of original men, and uses the popular every-day language appropriate to this standpoint. As Calvin in his commentary on Genesis 1 says: "Moses wrote in the popular style, which, without instruction, all ordinary persons endowed with common sense are able to understand. * * * He does not call us up to heaven; he only proposes things that lie open before our eyes."

It does not follow that because the Bible does not teach modern science, we are justified in saying that it contradicts it. What I see in these narratives of Genesis is that, so true is the standpoint of the author, so divine the illumination with which he is endowed, so unerring his insight into the order of nature, there is little in his description that even yet, with our advanced knowledge, we need to change. You say there is the "six days" and the question whether those days are meant to be measured by the twenty-four hours of the sun's revolution around the earth—I speak of these things popularly. It is difficult to see how they should be so measured when the sun that is to measure them is not introduced until the fourth day. Do not think that this larger reading of the days is a new speculation. You find Augustine in early times declaring that it is hard or altogether impossible to say of what fashion these days are, and Thomas Aquinas, in the middle ages, leaves the matter an open question. To my mind these narratives in Genesis stand out as a marvel, not for its discordance with science, but for *its agreement with it.*

Time does not permit me to enter into the details of the story of man's origin in Genesis, but I have already indicated the general point of view from which I think this narrative is to be regarded. It would be well if those who speak of disagreement with science would look to the great truths embedded in these narratives which science may be called upon to confirm. There is, for example:

(1) The truth that man is the last of God's created works —the crown and summit of God's creation. Does science contradict that?

(2) There is the great truth of the unity of the human race. No ancient people that I know of believed in such unity of the race, and even science until recently cast doubts upon it. How strange to find this great truth of the unity of the mankind confirmed in the pages of the Bible from the very beginning. This truth holds in it already the doctrine of monotheism, for if God is the Creator of the beings from whom the whole race sprang, He is the God of the whole race that sprang from them.

(3) There is the declaration that man was made in God's image—that God breathed into man a spirit akin to His own —does the science of man's nature contradict that, or does it not rather show that in his personal, spiritual nature man stands alone as bearing the image of God on earth, and founds a new kingdom in the world which can only be carried back in its origin to the divine creative cause.

(4) I might cite even the region of man's origin, for I think science increasingly points to this very region in Babylonia as the seat of man's origin. Is it then the picture of the condition in which man was created, pure and unfallen, and the idea that man, when introduced into the world, was not left as an orphaned being—the divine care was about him—that God spake with him and made known His will to him in such forms as he was able to apprehend—is it this that is in contradiction with history? It lies outside the

sphere of science to contradict this. Personally, I do not know of any worthier conception than that which supposes God to have placed Himself in communication with man, in living relations with His moral creatures, from the very first. Certainly there would be contradiction if Darwinian theory had its way and we had to conceive of man as a slow, gradual ascent from the bestial stage, but I am convinced, and have elsewhere sought to show, that genuine science teaches no such doctrine. Evolution is not to be identified offhand with Darwinianism. Later evolutionary theory may rather be described as a revolt against Darwinianism, and leaves the story open to a conception of man quite in harmony with that of the Bible. Of the fall, I have already said that if the story of it were not in the Bible we should require to put it there for ourselves in order to explain the condition of the world as it is.

On the question of patriarchial longevity, I would only say that there is here on the one hand the question of interpretation, for, as the most conservative theologians have come gradually to see, the names in these genealogies are not necessarily to be construed as only individuals. But I would add that I am not disposed to question the tradition of the extraordinary longevity in those olden times. Death, as I understand it, is not a necessary part of man's lot at all. Had man not sinned, he would never have died. Death—the separation of soul and body, the two integral parts of his nature—is something for him abnormal, unnatural. It is not strange, then, that in the earliest period life should have been much longer than it became afterward. Even a physiologist like Weissmann tells us that the problem for science today is—not why organisms live so long, but why they ever die.

I have referred to Babylonian story of the flood, and can only add a word on the alleged contradiction of science on this subject. Very confident statements are often made as to the impossibility of such a submergence of the inhabited

world, and destruction of human and animal life as the Bible represents. It would be well if those who speak thus confidently would study the accumulated evidence which distinguished scientific men have brought forward, that such a catastrophe as Genesis describes is not only possible, but has actually taken place since the advent of man. My attention was first drawn to this subject by an interesting lecture by the late Duke of Argyle given in Glasgow, and the same view has been advocated by other eminent geological specialists on glacial and post-glacial times, as Prestwich, Dawson, Howorth, Dr. Wright, etc. The universal terms employed need not be read as extending beyond the regions inhabited by man. There seems to be no substantial reason for doubting that in the flood of Noah we have an actual historical occurrence of which traditions appear to have survived in most regions of the world.

In conclusion, it is clear that the narratives of Creation, the Fall, the Flood, are not myths, but narratives enshrining the knowledge or memory of real transactions. The creation of the world was certainly not a myth, but a fact, and the representation of the stages of creation dealt likewise with facts. The language used was not that of modern science, but, under divine guidance, the sacred writer gives a broad, general picture which conveys a true idea of the order of the divine working in creation. Man's fall was likewise a tremendous fact, with universal consequences in sin and death to the race. Man's origin can only be explained through an exercise of direct creative activity, whatever subordinate factors evolution may have contributed. The flood was an historical fact, and the preservation of Noah and his family is one of the best and most widely attested of human traditions. In these narratives in Genesis and the facts which they embody are really laid the foundation of all else in the Bible. The unity of revelation binds them up with the Christian Gospel.

CHAPTER XII

ONE ISAIAH

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE L. ROBINSON, D. D.,
MCCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

"For about twenty-five centuries no one dreamt of doubting that Isaiah the son of Amoz was the author of every part of the book that goes under his name; and those who still maintain the unity of authorship are accustomed to point, with satisfaction, to the unanimity of the Christian Church on the matter, till a few German scholars arose, about a century ago, and called in question the unity of this book." Thus wrote the late Dr. A. B. Davidson, Professor of Hebrew in New College, Edinburgh, (*Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 244, 1903).

THE HISTORY OF CRITICISM

The critical disintegration of the Book of Isaiah began with Koppe, who in 1780 first doubted the genuineness of chapter 50. Nine years later Doederlein suspected the whole of chapters 40-66. He was followed by Rosenmueller, who was the first to deny to Isaiah the prophecy against Babylon in chapters 13:1-14:23. Eichhorn, at the beginning of the last century, further eliminated the oracle against Tyre in chapter 23, and, with Gesenius and Ewald, also denied the Isaianic origin of chapters 24-27. Gesenius also ascribed to some unknown prophet chapters 15 and 16. Rosenmueller went further, and pronounced against chapters 34 and 35; and not long afterwards (1840), Ewald questioned chapters 12 and 33. Thus by the middle of the nineteenth century some thirty-seven or thirty-eight chapters were rejected as no part of Isaiah's actual writings.

In 1879-80, the celebrated Leipzig professor, Franz

Delitzsch, who for years previous had defended the genuineness of the entire book, finally yielded to the modern critical position, and in the new edition of his commentary published in 1889, interpreted chapters 40-66, though with considerable hesitation, as coming from the close of the period of Babylonian exile. About the same time (1888-90), Canon Driver and Dr. George Adam Smith gave popular impetus to similar views in Great Britain.

Since 1890, the criticism of Isaiah has been even more trenchant and microscopic than before. Duhm, Stade, Guthe, Hackmann, Cornill and Marti on the Continent, and Cheyne, Whitehouse, Box, Glazebrook, Kennett and others in Great Britain and America, have questioned portions which hitherto were supposed to be genuine.

THE DISINTEGRATION OF "DEUTERO-ISAIAH"

Even the unity of chapters 40-66, which were supposed to be the work of the Second, or "Deutero-Isaiah," is given up. What prior to 1890 was supposed to be the unique product of some celebrated but anonymous sage who lived in Babylonia (about 550 B. C.), is now commonly divided and subdivided and in large part distributed among various writers from Cyrus to Simon.

At first it was thought sufficient to separate chapters 63-66 as a later addition to "Deutero-Isaiah's" prophecies; but more recently it has become the fashion to distinguish between chapters 40-55, which are alleged to have been written in Babylonia about 549-538 B. C., and chapters 56-66, which are now claimed to have been composed about 460-445 B. C. Some carry disintegration farther even than this, especially in the case of chapters 56-66, which are subdivided into various fragments and said to be the product of a school of writers rather than of a single pen. Opinions also conflict as to the place of their composition, whether in Babylonia, Palestine, Phoenicia, or Egypt.

RECENT VIEWS

Among the latest to investigate the problem is the Rev. Robert H. Kennett, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge, whose Schweich Lectures (1909) have recently been published for the British Academy by the Oxford University Press, 1910. The volume is entitled, "The Composition of the Book of Isaiah in the Light of History and Archaeology", and is a professed "attempt to tell in a simple way the story of the book of Isaiah." The results of his investigations he sums up as follows (pp. 84-85): (1) All of chapters 3, 5, 6, 7, 20 and 31, and portions of chapters 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 14, 17, 22 and 23, may be assigned to Isaiah the son of Amoz. (2) All of chapters 13, 40 and 47, and portions of chapters 14, 21, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46 and 48, may be assigned to the time of Cyrus. (3) All of chapters 15, 36, 37 and 39, and portions of chapters 16 and 38, may be assigned to the period between Nebuchadnezzar and Alexander the Great, but cannot be dated precisely. (4) Chapter 23:1-14 may be assigned to the time of Alexander the Great (332 B. C.). (5) All of chapters 11, 12, 19, 24-27, 29, 30, 32-35, 42, 49-66, and portions of chapters 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 23, 41, 44, 45 and 48, may be assigned to the second century B. C. Dr. Kennett thus assigns more than one-half of the book of Isaiah to the Maccabean Age.

Prof. C. F. Kent, also, in his "Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets," 1910, makes the following noteworthy observations on the prophecies of the so-called "Deutero-Isaiah." He says: "The prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah. . . . afford by far the best approach for the study of the difficult problems presented by Isaiah 40-66. . . . Chapters 56-66 are generally recognized as post-exilic. . . . In Isaiah 56 and the following chapters there are repeated references to the temple and its service, indicating that it had already been restored. More-

over, these references are not confined to the latter part of the book. . . . . The fact, on the one hand, that there are few, if any, allusions to contemporary events in these chapters, and, on the other hand, that little or nothing is known of the condition and hopes of the Jews during this period (the closing years of the Babylonian exile) makes the dating of these prophecies possible although far from certain. . . . Also the assumption that the author of these chapters lived in the Babylonian exile is not supported by a close examination of the prophecies themselves. Possibly their author was one of the few who, like Zerubbabel, had been born in Babylon and later returned to Palestine. He was also dealing with such broad and universal problems that he gives few indications of his date and place of abode; but all the evidence that is found points to Jerusalem as the place where he lived and wrote. . . The prophet's interest and point of view center throughout in Jerusalem, and he shows himself far more familiar with conditions in Palestine than in distant Babylon. Most of his illustrations are drawn from the agricultural life of Palestine. His vocabulary is also that of a man dwelling in Palestine, and in this respect is in marked contrast with the synonyms employed by Ezekiel, the prophet of the Babylonian exile" (pp. 27, 28).

That is to say, the two most recent investigators of the Book of Isaiah reach conclusions quite at variance with the opinions advocated in 1890, when Delitzsch so reluctantly allowed that chapters 40-66 may have sprung from the period of Babylonian exile. These last twenty-seven chapters are now found to have been written most probably in Palestine rather than in Babylonia, and are no longer claimed to speak primarily to the suffering exiles in captivity as was formerly supposed.

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE QUESTION

The present state of the Isaiah question is, to say the least, complex, if not chaotic. Those who deny the integrity of the

book may be divided into two groups which we may call moderates and radicals. Among the moderates may be included Drs. Driver, G. A. Smith, Skinner, Kirkpatrick, Koenig, A. B. Davidson and Whitehouse. These all practically agree that the following chapters and verses are *not Isaiah's*: 11:10-16; 12:1-6; 13:1-14:23; 15:1-16:12; 21:1-10; 24-27; 34-66. That is to say, some forty-four chapters out of the whole number, sixty-six, were not written by Isaiah; or, approximately 800 out of 1,292 verses are not genuine.

Among the radicals are Drs. Cheyne, Duhm, Hackmann, Guthe, Marti and Kennett. These all reject approximately 1,030 verses out of the total 1,292, retaining the following only as *the genuine product of Isaiah and his age:* 1:2-26, 29-31; 2:6-19; 3:1, 5, 8, 9, 12-17, 24; 4:1; 5:1-14, 17-29; 6:1-13; 7:1-8:22; 9:8-10:9; 10:13, 14, 27-32; 14:24-32; 17:1-14; 18:1-6; 20:1-6; 22:1-22; 28:1-4, 7-22; 29:1-6, 9, 10, 13-15; 30:1-17; 31:1-4. That is, only about 262 verses out of the total, 1,292, are allowed to be genuine.

This is, we believe, a fair statement of the Isaiah question as it exists today.

On the other hand, there are those who still defend the unity of Isaiah's book, e. g., Strachey (1874), Naegelsbach (1877), Bredenkamp (1887), Douglas (1895), W. H. Cobb (1883-1908), W. H. Green (1892), Vos (1898-99), Thirtle (1907) and Margoliouth (1910)*.

THE PRIME REASON FOR DISSECTING ISAIAH

The fundamental axiom of criticism is the dictum that a prophet always spoke out of a definite historical situation to the present needs of the people among whom he lived, and that a definite historical situation shall be pointed out for each prophecy. This fundamental postulate underlies all modern criticism of Old Testament prophecy.

*Compare also the writer's "The Book of Isaiah," Y. M. C. A. Press, N. Y., 1910.

This principle on the whole is sound, but it can easily be overworked. Certain cautions are necessary, for example:

(1) It is impossible to trace each separate section of prophecy, independently of its context, to a definite historical situation. Besides, the prophets often speak in poetry, and poetry ought not as a rule to be taken literally.

(2) It is not necessarily the greatest event in a nation's history or the event about which we happen to know the most, that may actually have given birth, humanly speaking, to a particular prophecy. Israel's history is full of crises and events, any one of which may easily be claimed to furnish an appropriate, or at least a possible, background for a given prophecy.

(3) The prophets usually spoke directly to the needs of their own generation, but they spoke also to the generations yet to come. Isaiah, for example, commanded, "Bind thou up the testimony, *seal the law among My disciples*" (8:16); that is, preserve My teachings for the future. Again in 30:8, he says, "Now go, write it before them on a tablet, and inscribe it in a book, *that it may be for the time to come forever and ever.*" And also in 42:23, "Who is there among you that will give ear to this? *that will hearken and hear for the time to come?*"

ALLEGED EXTERNAL EVIDENCE AGAINST UNITY

Recently certain writers have appealed to the author of 2 Chronicles to prove that chapters 40-66 existed as a separate collection in his age. Whitehouse in the New Century Bible ("Isaiah", Vol. I, p. 70), says: "This is clear from 2 Chron. 36:22 ff, in which the passage Isa. 44:28 (that Cyrus would cause the temple to be built) is treated as the word of Jeremiah. The so-called 'Deutero-Isaiah' (chs. 40-66) must at that time (c. 300 B. C.) have been regarded as a body of literature standing quite apart from the Isaianic collection or collections which then existed." But the evidence obtained from this source is so doubtful that it is well-nigh valueless.

For it is not the prediction concerning Cyrus to which the chronicler points as "the word of Jehovah by the mouth of Jeremiah," but "the three-score-and-ten years" spoken of in verse 21 of the same context which Jeremiah did predict. Cf. 2 Chron. 36:21. On the other hand, the *order* of the prophets among the Jews of antiquity was (1) Jeremiah, (2) Ezekiel, (3) Isaiah, and (4) The Twelve; accordingly, any portion of any of these prophecies might be cited as belonging to Jeremiah, because his book stood first.

In any case, to seek for external evidence in behalf of the dissection of the book is indicative!

THE LITERARY HISTORY OF THE BOOK

When or how the Book of Isaiah was edited and brought into its present form is unknown. Jesus ben-Sirach, the author of Ecclesiasticus, writing c. 180 B. C., cites Isaiah as one of the notable worthies of Hebrew antiquity, in whose days, "the sun went backward and he added life to the king" (Ecclus. 48:20-25; cf. Isa. 38:4-8); and he adds, who "saw by an excellent spirit that which should come to pass at the last, and comforted them that mourned in Zion." Evidently, therefore, at the beginning of the second century B. C., at the latest, the Book of Isaiah had reached its present form, and the last twenty-seven chapters were already ascribed to the son of Amoz.

Furthermore, there is absolutely no proof that chapters 1-39, or any other considerable section of Isaiah's prophecies ever existed by themselves as an independent collection; nor is there any ground for thinking that the promissory and Messianic portions have been systematically interpolated by editors long subsequent to Isaiah's own time. It is quite arbitrary to suppose that the earlier prophets only threatened.

CERTAIN FALSE PRESUPPOSITIONS

Certain false presuppositions govern critics in their disin-

tegration of the Book of Isaiah. Only a few examples need be given by way of illustration.

(1) To one, "the conversion of the heathen" lay quite beyond the horizon of any eighth-century prophet, and consequently Isa. 2:2-4 and all similar passages should be relegated to a subsequent age.

(2) To another, "the picture of universal peace" in Isa. 11:1-9 is a symptom of late date, and therefore this section and kindred ones must be deleted.

(3) To another, the thought of "universal judgment" upon "the whole earth" in chapter 14:26 quite transcends Isaiah's range of thought.

(4) To still another, the apocalyptic character of chapters 24-27 represents a phase of Hebrew thought which prevailed in Israel only after Ezekiel.

(5) Even to those who are considered moderates the poetic character of a passage like chapter 12 and the references to a *return* from captivity as in 11:11-16, and the promises and consolations such as are found in chapter 33, are cited as grounds for assigning these and kindred passages to a much later age. Radicals deny *in toto* the existence of Messianic passages among Isaiah's own predictions.

But, to deny to Isaiah of the eighth century all catholicity of grace, all universalism of salvation or judgment, every highly developed Messianic ideal, every rich note of promise and comfort, all sublime faith in the sacrosanct character of Zion, as some do, is unwarrantably to create a new Isaiah of greatly reduced proportions, a mere preacher of righteousness, a statesman of not very optimistic vein, and the exponent of a cold ethical religion without the warmth and glow of the messages which are actually ascribed to the prophet of the eighth century.

THE WRITER'S PERSONAL ATTITUDE

More and more the writer is persuaded that the fundamental postulates of much criticism are unsound, and that

broad facts must decide the unity or collective character of Isaiah's book. To determine the exact historical background of each individual section is simply impossible, as the history of criticism plainly shows. Verbal exegesis may do more harm than good. Greater regard must be paid to the *structure* of the book. When treated as an organic whole, the book is a grand masterpiece. One great purpose dominates the author throughout, which, as he proceeds, is brought to a climax in a picture of Israel's redemption and the glorification of Zion. Failure to recognize this unity incapacitates a man to do it exegetical justice. The prophecies of the Book of Isaiah simply can not be properly understood without some comprehension of the author's scheme of thought as a whole. There is an obvious, though it may be to some extent an editorial, unity to Isaiah's prophecies. But there is as true a unity in the Book of Isaiah as is usually found *in a volume of sermons*. To regard them as a heterogeneous mass of miscellaneous prophecies which were written at widely separated times and under varied circumstances from Isaiah's own period down to the Maccabean age, and freely interpolated throughout the intervening centuries, is to lose sight of the great historic realities and perspective of the prophet. In short the whole problem of how much or how little Isaiah wrote would become immensely simplified if critics would only divest themselves of a mass of unwarranted presuppositions and arbitrary restrictions which fix hard and fast what each century can think and say.

Accordingly, the writer's attitude is that of those who, while welcoming all ascertained results of investigation, decline to accept any mere conjectures or theories as final conclusions. And while he acknowledges his very great debt to critics of all latitudes, he nevertheless believes that the Book of Isaiah, practically as we have it, may have been, and probably was, all written by Isaiah, the son of Amoz, in the latter half of the eighth century B. C.

ARGUMENTS FOR ONE ISAIAH

It is as unreasonable to expect to be able to prove the unity of Isaiah as to suppose that it has been disproven. Internal evidence is indecisive in either case. There are arguments, however, which corroborate a belief that there was but one Isaiah. Here are some of those which might be mentioned:

1. *The Circle of Ideas* is strikingly the same throughout. For example, take the name for God which is almost peculiar to the Book of Isaiah, "the Holy One of Israel". This title for Jehovah occurs in the Book of Isaiah a total of twenty-five times and only six times elsewhere in the Old Testament (one of which is in a parallel passage). It interlocks all the various portions with one another and stamps them with the personal imprimatur of him who saw the vision of the majestic God seated upon His throne, high and lifted up, and heard the angelic choirs singing: "Holy, Holy, Holy is Jehovah of hosts: the whole earth is full of Thy glory" (Chapter 6). The presence of this Divine name in all the different sections of the book is of more value in identifying Isaiah as the author of all these prophecies than though his name had been inscribed at the beginning of every chapter, for the reason that his theology is woven into the very fiber and texture of the whole book.

The title occurs twelve times in chapters 1-39, and thirteen times in chapters 40-66; and it is simply unscientific to say that the various alleged authors of the disputed portions all employed the same title through imitation. (Isa. 1:4; 5:19, 24; 10:20; 12:6; 17:7; 29:19; 30:11, 12, 15; 31:1; 37: 23. Also, 41:14, 16, 20; 43:3, 14; 45:11; 47:4; 48:17; 49:7; 54:5; 55:5; 60:9, 14. Compare 2 Kings 19:22; Psa. 71:22; 78:41; 89:18; Jer. 50:29; 51:5.)

Another unique idea which occurs with considerable repetition in the Book of Isaiah is the thought of a "highway". Cf. 11:16; 35:8; 40:3; 43:19; 49:11; 57:14; 62:10.

Another is the idea of a "remnant". Cf. 1:9; 6:13; 10:20, 21, 22; 11:11, 12, 16; 14:22, 30; 15:9; 16:14; 17:3, 6; 21:17; 28:5; 37:31; 46:3; 65:8, 9.

Another is the position occupied by "Zion" in the prophet's thoughts. Cf. 2:3; 4:5; 18:7; 24:23; 27:13; 28:16; 29:8; 30:19; 31:9; 33:5, 20; 34:8; 46:13; 49:14; 51:3, 11; 52:1; 57:13; 59:20; 60:14; 62:1, 11; 65:11, 25; 66:8.

Still another is the expression, "pangs of a woman in travail." Cf. 13:8; 21:3; 26:17, 18; 42:14; 54:1; 66:7.

All these, and many others which are less distinctive, stamp psychologically the book with an individuality which it is difficult to account for if it be broken up into various sections and distributed, as some do, over the centuries.

2. *Literary Style.*

As negative evidence, literary style is not a very safe argument, for as Professor McCurdy says, "In the case of a writer of Isaiah's endowments, style is not a sure criterion of authorship" ("History, Prophecy and the Monuments," II, p. 317 n.). Yet it is remarkable that the clause, "for the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken it", should be found three times in the Book of Isaiah, and nowhere else in the Old Testament. Cf. 1:20; 40:5; 58:14.

It is also singular that the Divine title, "the Mighty One of Israel," should occur three times in Isaiah and nowhere else in the Old Testament. Cf. 1:24; 49:26; 60:16.

And it is noteworthy that the phrase, "streams of water," should occur twice in Isaiah and nowhere else. Cf. 30:25; 44:4.

And most peculiar is the tendency on the part of the author to emphatic reduplication. Cf. 2:7, 8; 6:3; 8:9; 24:16, 19; 40:1; 43:11, 25; 48:15; 51:12; 57:19; 62:10.

Isaiah's style differs widely from that of every other Old Testament prophet and is as far removed as possible from that of Ezekiel and the post-exilic prophets.

3. *Historical References.*

Take for example, first, the prophet's constant reference to Judah and Jerusalem, 1:7-9; 3:8; 5:13; 24:19; 25:2; 40:2, 9; 62:4. Also, to the temple and its ritual of worship and sacrifice. In chapter 1:11-15, when all was prosperous, the prophet complained that the people are profuse and formal in their ceremonies and sacrifices; in chapter 43:23, 24, on the contrary, when the country had been overrun by the Assyrians and Sennacherib had beseiged the city, the prophet complains that they had not brought to Jehovah the sheep of their burnt offerings, nor honored Him with their sacrifices. In chapter 66:1-3, 6, 20, not only is the existence of the temple and the observance of the temple ritual presupposed, but those are sentenced who place their trust in the material temple, and the outward ceremonials of temple worship.

As for the "exile", the prophet's attitude to it throughout is that of both anticipation and realization. Thus in chapter 57:1, judgment is only threatened, not yet inflicted: "The righteous is taken away *from the evil to come.*" That is to say, the exile is described as still future. On the other hand, in chapter 3:8, "Jerusalem is ruined, and Judah is fallen"; while in chapter 11:11, 12, "the Lord will set His hand again the second time to recover the remnant . . . from the four corners of the earth." To interpret such statements literally without regard to Isaiah's manifest attitude to the exile, leads only to confusion. No prophet realized so keenly or described so vividly the destiny of the Hebrews.

4. *The Predictive Element.*

This is the strongest proof of the unity of the Book of Isaiah. Prediction is the very essence of prophecy. Isaiah was pre-eminently a *prophet of the future.* With unparalleled suddenness he repeatedly leaps from despair to hope, from threat to promise, from the actual to the ideal. What Kent says of "Deutero-Isaiah" may with equal justice be said of Isaiah himself: "While in touch with his own age, the great unknown prophet lives in the atmosphere of the past and the

future" (Cf. "Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets", p. 28).

Isaiah spoke to his own age, but he also addressed himself to the ages to come. His verb tenses are characteristically futures and prophetic perfects. Of him A. B. Davidson's words are particularly true: "If any prophetic book be examined . . . it will appear that the ethical and religious teaching is always secondary, and that the essential thing in the book or discourse is the prophet's outlook into the future" (Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, article, "Prophecy and Prophets").

Isaiah was exceptionally given to predicting: thus,

(1) *Before the Syro-Ephraimitic war (734 B. C.),* he predicted that within sixty-five years Ephraim should be broken in pieces (7:8); and that before the child Maher-shalal-hash-baz should have knowledge to cry, "My father" or "My mother", the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria should be carried away (8:4; cf. 7:16). There are numerous other predictions among his earlier prophecies. (Cf. 1:27, 28; 2:2-4; 6:13; 10:20-23; 11:6-16; 17:14.)

(2) *Shortly before the downfall of Samaria in 722 B. C.* Isaiah predicted that Tyre shall be forgotten seventy years, and that after the end of seventy years her merchandise shall be holiness of Jehovah. (Cf. Isa. 23:15.)

(3) *Likewise prior to the siege of Ashdod in 711 B. C.,* he proclaimed that within three years Moab should be brought into contempt (Isa. 16:14), and that within a year all the glory of Kedar should fail (Isa. 21:16).

(4) *And not long prior to the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib in 701 B. C.,* he predicted that in an instant, suddenly, a multitude of Jerusalem's foes should be as dust (Isa. 29:5); that yet a very little while and Lebanon should be turned into a fruitful field (Isa. 29:17); that Assyria should be dismayed and fall by the sword but not of men (Isa. 30:17, 31; 31:8). Furthermore, that for days beyond a year, the careless women

of Jerusalem should be troubled (Isa. 32:10, 16-20); and that the righteous in Zion should see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, and return and come with singing (Isa. 33:17-24; 35:4, 10); but that Sennacherib on the contrary should hear tidings and return without shooting an arrow into the city (Isa. 37:7, 26-29, 33-35).

In like manner *after* the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib, 701 B. C., the prophet continued to predict; and, in order to demonstrate to the suffering remnant about him the deity of Jehovah and the folly of idolatry, pointed to the predictions which he had already made in the earlier years of his ministry, and to the fact that they had been fulfilled. For example, he says:

In chapter 41:21-23, 26 ff.: "Who hath declared it from the beginning that we may know, and beforetime that we may say, He is right?"

In chapter 42:9, 23: "Behold the former things are come to pass and new things do I declare; before they spring forth I tell you of them."

In chapter 43:9, 12: "Who among them can declare this and show us former things? [i. e., things to come in the immediate future.] I have declared, and I have saved and I have showed."

In chapter 44:7, 8, 27, 28: "Who, as I, shall call, and shall declare it? . . . The things that are coming and that shall come to pass, let them [the idols] declare. Have not I declared unto thee of old and showed it? And ye are My witnesses. . . . That saith of Cyrus, He is My shepherd, and shall perform all My pleasure, even saying of Jerusalem, she shall be built; and of the temple, thy foundation shall be laid."

In chapter 45:1-4, 11, 21: "It is I Jehovah, who call thee by thy name, even the God of Israel. . . . I have called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee though thou hast not known Me. . . . Ask of Me the things that are to come.

. . . I have raised him [Cyrus] up in righteousness, and he shall build My city, and he shall let My exiles go free."

In chapter 46:10, 11: "Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times things that are not yet done; . . . calling a ravenous bird [Cyrus] from the east, the man of My counsel. . . . Yea, I have spoken, I will also bring it to pass."

In chapter 48:3, 5: "I have declared the former things from of old, . . . and I showed them, suddenly I did them, and they came to pass. . . . I have declared it to thee from of old; before it came to pass I showed it thee; lest thou shouldest say, Mine idol hath done them."

And again in chapter 48:6-8, 14-16: "I have showed thee new things from this time, even hidden things; . . . before this day thou heardest them not, . . . yea, from of old thine ear was not opened, . . . Who, among them hath declared these things? . . . I even I have spoken; yea, I have called him; from the beginning I have not spoken in secret." To which long list of predictions the prophet adds by way of lamentation: "Oh, that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments [including predictions]! then had thy peace been like a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea" (48:18).

CYRUS A SUBJECT OF PREDICTION

From all these numerous explicit and oft-repeated predictions one thing is obvious, namely, that great emphasis is laid on prediction throughout the Book of Isaiah. "Cyrus" must be considered as predicted from any point of view. The only question is, Does the prophet emphasize the fact that he is himself predicting the coming of Cyrus? or, that former predictions concerning Cyrus are now in his time coming to pass?

Canon Cheyne's remark upon this point is apropos. He says: "The editor, who doubtless held the later Jewish theory of prophecy, may have inferred from a number of passages,

especially 41:26; 48:3, 6, 14, that the first appearance of Cyrus had been predicted by an ancient prophet, and observing certain Isaianic elements in the phraseology of these chapters may have identified the prophet with Isaiah" ("Introduction to the Book of Isaiah," p. 238). Why not regard "the editor's" inference legitimate?

Dr. George Adam Smith likewise allows that Cyrus is the fulfillment of *former predictions.* He says: "Nor is it possible to argue as some have tried to do, that the prophet is predicting these things as if they had already happened. For as part of an argument for the unique divinity of the God of Israel, Cyrus, alive and irresistible, and already accredited with success, is pointed out as the unmistakable proof that *former* prophecies of a deliverance for Israel are already coming to pass. Cyrus, in short, is not presented as a prediction but as a proof *that a prediction is being fulfilled"* (Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, art. "Isaiah", p. 493). Further, he says: "The chief claim, therefore, which chapters 40 ff. make for the God of Jehovah is His power to direct the history of the world in conformity to a long predicted and faithfully followed purpose. This claim starts from the proof *that Jehovah has long before predicted events now happening* or about to happen, with Cyrus as their center" (Idem, p. 496).*

Hence in any case it must be allowed that Cyrus is the subject of prediction. It really makes little difference at which end of history one stands, whether in the eighth century B. C. or in the sixth, *Cyrus, to the author of chapters 40-48, is the subject of prediction.* Whether, indeed, he is really predicting Cyrus in advance of all fulfillment, or whether Cyrus to him is the fulfillment of some ancient prediction does not alter the fact that Cyrus was the subject of prediction on the part of somebody. As was stated above, the whole question is, which does the prophet emphasize, (1) the fact that he is predict-

*The italics are ours.

ing? or, (2) that former predictions are now before his eyes coming to pass? The truth is, the prophet seems to live in the atmosphere of both the past and the future. This is true of Isaiah, who in his inaugural vision (ch. 6) paints a scene which Delitzsch describes as "like a prediction in the process of being fulfilled". The same is presumably true of chapters 24-27. There the prophet repeatedly projects himself into the future, and speaks from the standpoint of the fulfillment of his prediction. This was an outstanding characteristic of Isaiah. At one time he emphasizes the fact that he is predicting, and a little later he seems to emphasize that his predictions are coming to pass. Accordingly, if a decision must be made as to when Cyrus was actually predicted, it is obviously necessary to assume that he was predicted *long before his actual appearance.*

This is in keeping with the Deuteronomic test of prophecy, which says: "When a prophet speaketh in the name of Jehovah, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which Jehovah hath not spoken; the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously, thou shalt not be afraid of him" (Deut. 18:22).

There is a similar prediction in the Old Testament: King Josiah was predicted by name two centuries before he came. (1 Kings 13:2; cf. 2 Kings 23:15, 16.)

Dr. W. H. Cobb, in the "Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis", 1901 (p. 79), pleads for a "shrinkage of Cyrus", because Cyrus figures only in chapters 40-48, and is then dismissed. Dr. Thirtle in his volume entitled, "Old Testament Problems" (pp. 244-264), argues that the name "Cyrus" is a mere appellative, being originally not *Koresh* (Cyrus), but *Horesh* (workman, artificer, image-breaker), and that chapter 44:27, 28 is therefore a gloss. But in opposition to these views the present writer prefers to write Cyrus large, and to allow frankly that he is the subject of prediction; for, the very point of the author's argument is, that he is predicting events

which Jehovah alone is capable of foretelling or bringing to pass; in other words, that prescience is the proof of Jehovah's deity.

Isaiah lived in an age when prediction was needed; cf. Amos 3:9. Political events were kaleidoscopic and there was every incentive to predict. But Jehovah's predictions alone were trustworthy.

That Isaiah's prophecies contain wonderful predictions is attested both by Jesus ben-Sirach in Ecclus. 48-20-25, which was written about 180 B. C., and by Josephus in his "Antiquities" XI, I, 1, 2, dating from about 100 A. D.

Why should men object to prediction on so large a scale? Unless there is definiteness about any given prediction, unless it transcends ordinary prognostication there is no especial value in it. The only possible objection is that prediction of so minute a character is "abhorrent to reason". But the answer to such an objection is already at hand; it may be abhorrent to reason, but it is certainly a handmaid to faith. Faith has to do with the future even as prediction has to do with the future; and the Old Testament is pre-eminently a book which encourages faith.

The one outstanding differentiating characteristic of Israel's religion is predictive prophecy. Only the Hebrews ever predicted the coming of the Messiah of the kingdom of God. Accordingly, to predict the coming of a Cyrus as the *human* agent of Israel's salvation is but the reverse side of the same prophet's picture of the *Divine* agent, the obedient, suffering Servant of Jehovah, who would redeem Israel from their sin.

Deny to Isaiah the son of Amoz the predictions concerning Cyrus, and the prophecy is robbed of its essential character and unique perspective; emasculate these latter chapters of Isaiah of their predictive feature, and they are reduced to a mere *vaticinium ex eventu,* and their religious value is largely lost.

CHAPTER XIII

THE BOOK OF DANIEL

BY PROFESSOR JOSEPH D. WILSON, D. D.,
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA,
AUTHOR OF "DID DANIEL WRITE DANIEL?"

Modern objections to the Book of Daniel were started by German scholars who were prejudiced against the supernatural. Daniel foretells events which have occurred in history. Therefore, argue these scholars, the alleged predictions must have been written after the events.

But the supernatural is not impossible, nor is it improbable, if sufficient reason for it exists. It is not impossible, for instance, that an event so marvellous as the coming of the Divine into humanity in the person of Jesus Christ should be predicted. So far from being impossible, it seems to common sense exceedingly probable; and furthermore, it seems not unreasonable that a prophet predicting a great and far distant event, like that indicated above, should give some evidence to his contemporaries or immediate successors that he was a true prophet. Jeremiah foretold the seventy years captivity. Could his hearers be warranted in believing that? Certainly. For he also foretold that all those lands would be subjected to the king of Babylon. A few years showed this latter prophecy to be true, and reasonable men believed the prediction about the seventy years.

But the attacks of the German scholars would have been innocuous had it not been for their copyists. The German scholars—even theological professors—are not necessarily Christians. Religion is with them an interesting psychological phenomenon. Their performances are not taken too seriously

by their compeers. But outside of their learned circles a considerable number of writers and professors in schools, anxious to be in the forefront, have taken the German theories for proven facts, and by saying "all scholars are agreed," etc., have spread an opinion that the Book of Daniel is a pious fraud.

There is another class of impugners of Daniel—good men, who do not deny the ability of God to interpose in human affairs and foretell to His servants what shall be hereafter. These men, accepting as true what they hear asserted as the judgment of "all scholars" and regretfully supposing that Daniel is a fiction, have endeavored to save something from the wreck of a book which has been the stay of suffering saints through the ages, by expatiating on its moral and religious teaching. It is probable that these apologists—victims themselves of a delusion which they did not create but which they have hastily and foolishly accepted—have done more harm than the mistaken scholars or the hasty copyists, for they have fostered the notion that a frand may be used for holy ends, and that a forger is a proper teacher of religious truth, and that the Son of God approved a lie.

The scholars find that in chapter 8 of Daniel, under the figure of a very little horn, Antiochus Epiphanes is predicted as doing much hurt to the Jews. The vision is of the ram and he-goat which represent Persia and Greece, so specified by name. A notable horn of the he-goat, Alexander the Great, was broken, and in its place came four horns, the four kingdoms into which the Greek empire was divided. From one of these four sprang the little horn. That this refers primarily to Antiochus Epiphanes there is no doubt. He died about 163 B. C. The theory of the rationalistic critics is that some "pious and learned Jew" wrote the Book of Daniel at that time to encourage the Maccabees in their revolt against this bad king; that the book pretends to have been written in Babylon, 370 years before, in order to make it pass current as a revelation from God. This theory has been supported

by numerous arguments, mostly conjectural, all worthless and, in a recent publication, a few designedly delusive.

The imaginary Jew is termed "pious" because lofty religious ideas mark the book, and "learned" because he exhibits so intimate an acquaintance with the conditions and environments of the Babylonian court four centuries before his date. But as no man, however learned, can write an extended history out of his own imagination without some inaccuracies, the critics have searched diligently for mistakes. The chief of these supposed mistakes will be considered below.

We meet a difficulty at the threshold of the critics' hypothesis. Dan. 9:26 predicts the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple; a calamity so frightful to the Jewish mind that the Septuagint shrank from translating the Hebrew. What sort of encouragement was this? The hypothesis limps at the threshold.

Having Antiochus Epiphanes in chapter 8 the rationalistic critics try to force him into chapter 7. They find a little horn in chapter 7, and struggle to identify him with the "very little horn" of chapter 8. There is no resemblance between them. The words translated "little horn" are different in the different chapters. The little horn of chapter 7 springs up as an eleventh horn among *ten* kings. He is diverse from other kings. He continues till the Son of Man comes in the clouds of heaven and the kingdom which shall never be destroyed is set up. Antiochus Epiphanes, the little horn of chapter 8, comes out of one of the *four* horns into which Alexander's kingdom resolved itself. He was not diverse from other kings, but was like scores of other bad monarchs, and he did not continue till the Son of Man.

These divergencies render the attempted identification absurd, but an examination of the two sets of prophecies in their entirety shows this clearly. Chapters 2 and 7 are a prophecy of the world's history to the end. Chapters 8 and 11 refer to a crisis in Jewish history, a crisis now long past.

Chapter 2, the Image with its head of gold, breast of silver, belly of brass, legs of iron, feet and toes of mingled iron and clay, tells of four world-kingdoms, to be succeeded by a number of sovereignties, some strong, some weak, which would continue till the God of heaven should set up a kingdom never to be destroyed. Chapter 7, the Four Beasts, is parallel to the Image. The same four world-empires are described; the fourth beast, strong and terrible, to be succeeded by ten kings, who should continue till the coming of the Son of Man, who should set up an everlasting kingdom.

These four world-empires were Babylon, Persia, Greece and Rome. There have been no other world-empires since. Efforts have been made to unite the divided sovereignties of Europe by royal intermarriages and by conquest, but the iron and clay would not cleave together. The rapidity of the Greek conquest is symbolized by the swift leopard with four wings; its division by four heads. The Roman empire is diverse from the others—it was a republic and its iron strength is dissipated among the nations which followed it and which exist today, still iron and clay.

These prophecies which are illustrated in every particular by history to the present moment stand in the way of the unbelieving theory. The Roman empire, the greatest of all, must be eliminated to get rid of prediction, and any shift promising that end has been welcomed. One set of critics makes the kingdom of the Seleucidae, which was one of the parts of the Greek empire, the fourth world-kingdom, but it never was a world-kingdom. It was part of the Greek empire—one of the four heads upon the leopard. Another set creates an imaginary Median empire between Babylon and Persia. There was no such empire. The Medo-Persian empire was one. Cyrus, the Persian, conquered Babylon. All history says so and the excavations prove it.

Among the nations which were to take the place of the fallen Roman empire, another power was to rise—"a little

horn," shrewd and arrogant. It was to wear out the saints of the Most High, to be diverse from the other ten sovereignties, to have the other sovereignties given into its hand, and to keep its dominion till the coming of the Son of Man.

Whatever this dread power is, or is to be, it was to follow the fall of the Roman empire and to rise among the nations which, ever since, in some form or other have existed where Rome once held sway. Whether that power, differing from civil governments and holding dominance over them, exists now and has existed for more than a thousand years, or is to be developed in the future, it was to arise in the Christian era. The words are so descriptive, that no reader would ever have doubted were it not that the prophecy involves prediction.

The attempt of the "very little horn" of chapter 8, Antiochus Epiphanes, to extirpate true religion from the earth, failed. Yet it was well-nigh successful. The majority of the nation were brought to abandon Jehovah and to serve Diana. The high priest in Jerusalem sent the treasurers of the temple to Antioch as an offering to Hercules. Jews out-bade each other in their subservience to Antiochus. His cruelties were great but his blandishments were more effective for his purpose; "by peace he destroyed many". Idolatrous sacrifices were offered throughout Judea. Judaism was all but dead, and with its death the worship of the one God would have found no place in all the earth.

This prophecy encouraged the few faithful ones to resist the Greek and their own faithless fellow countrymen. God foresaw and forewarned. The warning was unheeded by the mass of the Jews. Sadduceeism then did not believe in the supernatural and it has repeated its disbelief. Fortunately there was a believing remnant and true religion was saved from extinction.

The Seventy Weeks. (Dan. 9:24-27.) "Weeks" in this prophecy are not weeks of days but "sevens," probably years,

but whether astronomical years of 365¼ days or prophetic years of 360 days does not appear. Our Lord's saying when referring to the prophecy of Daniel (Matt. 24:15), "Let him that readeth understand," seems to indicate a peculiarity about the period foretold.

From the issuance of a commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem unto Messiah there would be sixty-nine sevens, i. e., 483 years. Messiah would be cut off and have nothing, and the people of a prince would destroy Jerusalem and the temple.

It came to pass in the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate. Messiah appeared; He was cut off; He had nothing, no place to lay His head, nothing except a cross. And before the generation which crucified Him passed away, the soldiers of the Roman emperor destroyed the city and sanctuary, slew all the priests and ended Jewish church and nation.

Unto Messiah the Prince there were to be 483 years from an edict to rebuild Jerusalem. That edict was issued in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus. Somewhere between 454 B. C. and 444 B. C. is the date, with the preponderance of opinion in favor of the later date. Four hundred and eighty-three years brings us to 29—39 A. D. Or, if prophetic years are meant, the *terminus ad quem* is 22—32 A. D. Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judea from 26 A. D. to 36 A. D.

All this is plain enough, and if the words of Daniel had been written after the death of our Saviour and the fall of Jerusalem, no one could fail to see that Jesus Christ is indicated. But if written in the exile this would be supernatural prediction, and hence the struggles of the critics to evade somehow the implications of the passage. To find some prominent person who was "cut off" prior to 163 B. C. was the first desideratum. The high priest Onias, who was murdered through the intrigues of rival candidates for his office, was the most suitable person. He was in no respect

the Messiah, but having been anointed he might be made to serve. He died 171 B. C. The next step was to find an edict to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, 483 years before 171 B. C. That date was 654 B. C., during the reign of Manasseh, son of Hezekiah. No edict could be looked for there. But by deducting 49 years, the date was brought to 605 B. C., and as in that year Jeremiah had foretold (Jer. 25:9) the destruction of Jerusalem, perhaps this would do.

There were two objections to this hypothesis; one, that a prophecy of desolation and ruin to a city and sanctuary then in existence was not a commandment to restore and rebuild, and the other objection was that this also was a supernatural prediction, and as such, offensive to the critical mind. Accordingly, recourse was had to the decree of Cyrus (Ezra 1:1-4) made in 536 B. C. But the decree of Cyrus authorized, not the building of Jerusalem, but the building of the temple. It is argued that forts and other defences, including a city wall must have been intended by Cyrus, and this would be rebuilding Jerusalem; but the terms of the edict are given and no such defences are mentioned. Nor is it likely that a wise man like Cyrus would have intended or permitted a fortified city to be built in a remote corner of his empire close to his enemy, Egypt, with which enemy the Jews had frequently coquetted in previous years. At all events, the city was not restored until the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, as appears from Neh. 2:3, 8, 13, etc., where Nehemiah laments the defenceless condition of Jerusalem. Permission to build could safely be given then, for Egypt had been conquered and the loyalty of the Jews to Persia had been tested. Moreover, the date of Cyrus' decree does not meet the conditions. From 536 B. C. to 171 B. C. is 365 years and not 483. A "learned and pious Jew" would not have made such a blunder in arithmetic in foisting a forgery upon his countrymen.

There were four decrees concerning Jerusalem issued by the Persian court. The first under Cyrus, alluded to above,

the second under Darius Hystaspis. (Ezra 6.) The third in the seventh year of Artaxerxes. (Ezra 7:12-26.) All of these concern the temple. The fourth in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes was the only one to restore and rebuild a walled town.

The Book of Daniel was translated into Greek about 123 B. C., forty years after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes. This prophecy of the Seventy Weeks troubled the Jewish translators. It foretold disaster to Jerusalem. City and sanctuary would be destroyed. They had been destroyed 464 years before by Nebuchadnezzar. Would they be destroyed again? The translators were unwilling to believe that such a calamity would occur again. Could they not make out that the words referred to the troubles under Antiochus? It was true that he had destroyed neither city nor temple, but he had polluted the temple. Perhaps that was equivalent to destruction. At all events they did not dare to say that another destruction of Jerusalem lay in the future.

But there stood the words. From the going forth of commandment to restore Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince would be seven weeks and three score and two weeks, 483 years. They could do nothing with those words. They left them out, and mangled the rest of the passage to give obscurely the impression that the disasters there foretold were a thing of the past.

This mistranslation of a Divine oracle to make it say what they wished it to say was a high-handed proceeding, but it did not prevent its fulfillment. At the time appointed Messiah came and was crucified and Jerusalem fell. The critics' efforts to force some meaning, other than a prediction of Christ, into this prophecy is thus seen to be not without precedent.

SUPPOSED INACCURACIES

But the rationalistic interpretations of the forementioned great prophecies are so unnatural, so evidently forced in order

to sustain a preconceived theory, that they would have deceived none except those predisposed to be deceived. Accordingly attempts have been made to discredit the Book of Daniel; to show that it could not have been written in Babylon; to expose historical inaccuracies and so forth. The scholars discovered some supposed inaccuracies, and, the fashion having been set, the imitation scholars eagerly sought for more and with the help of imagination have compiled a considerable number. They are in every case instances of the inaccuracy of the critics.

(1) First, may be mentioned, as the only one ever having had any weight, *the fact that no historian mentions Belshazzar.* It was therefore assumed that "the learned and pious Jew", whom the critics imagined, had invented the name. Since 1854 this "inaccuracy" has disappeared from the rationalistic dictionaries and other productions. The excavations have answered that.

(2) Disappointed at the discovery of the truth, the critics now find fault with *the title "king" which Daniel gives to Belshazzar* and assert that *no tablets have been found dated in his reign.* It is not probable that any such tablets will be found, for his father outlived him and even though Belshazzar were co-king, his father's name would be in the dates. The tablets, however, show that Belshazzar was the commander of the troops, that he was the man of action—his father being a studious recluse—that he was the darling of the people and that the actual administration was in his hands. He was the heir to the throne and even if not formally invested, was the virtual king in the eyes of the people.

(3) It is objected next that *Belshazzar was not the son of Nebuchadnezzar as the queen mother says in Dan. 5:11.* If he were the grandson through his mother the same language would be used, and the undisturbed reign of Nabonidus in turbulent Babylon is accounted for in this way.

(4) The quibble that *the monuments do not say that*

Belshazzar was slain at the taking of Babylon is unworthy of the scholar who makes it. It is admitted that Belshazzar was a prominent figure before the city was captured, that "the son of the king died" and that he then "disappeared from history". He was heir to the kingdom. He was a soldier. His dynasty was overthrown. He disappeared from history. Common sense can make its inference.

(5) It is hard, however, for the impugners of Daniel to let the Belshazzar argument go. To have him appear prominently in the inscriptions, after criticism had decided that he never existed, is awkward. Accordingly, we have a long dissertation ("Sayce's Higher Crit. and Monuments," 497-531) showing that *the claim of Cyrus to have captured Babylon without fighting* is inconsistent with the accounts of the secular historians, which dwell upon the long siege, the desperate fighting, the turning of the river, the surprise at night, etc. Very well, the two accounts are inconsistent. But what has this to do with Daniel? His account is as follows:

"In that night was Belshazzar the Chaldean king slain, and Darius the Mede received the kingdom" (Dan. 5:31). Not a word about a siege, etc. An account entirely consistent with the inscription of Cyrus. And yet the critic has the audacity to say that "the monumental evidence has here pronounced against the historical accuracy of the Scripture narrative"! ("H. C. & M.", 531). This is not criticism; it is misrepresentation.

(6) *Daniel mentions the "Chaldeans" as a guild of wise men.* This has been made a ground of attack. "In the time of the exile", they tell us, "the Chaldeans were an imperial nation. Four centuries afterward the term signified a guild; therefore, Daniel was written four centuries afterward". It is strange that none of the critics consulted Herodotus, the historian nearest to Daniel in time. He visited Babylon in the same century with Daniel and uses the word in the same sense as Daniel and in no other. (Herod. 1:181, 185.)

(7) *The Book of Daniel spells Nebuchadnezzar with an "n" in the penultimate instead of an "r";* therefore, the critics argue, it must have been written 370 years later. But Ezra spells it with an "n". So do 2 Kings, 1 & 2 Chronicles, and so does Jeremiah seven times out of sixteen. Jeremiah preceded Daniel and if either Kings or Chronicles was written in Babylon we have the same spelling in the same country and about the same time.

(8) As to *the Greek words in Daniel,* relied on by Driver to prove a late date: when we discover that these are the names of musical instruments and that the Babylonians knew the Greeks in commerce and in war and realize that musical instruments carry their native names with them, this argument vanishes like the rest.

(9) But, it is urged, *Daniel gives the beginning of the captivity* (1:1) *in the third year of Jehoiakim, 606 B. C., whereas Jerusalem was not destroyed till 587 B. C.,* therefore, etc.

Daniel dates the captivity from the time that he and the other youths were carried away. A glance at the history will suggest when that was. Pharaoh Necho came out of Egypt against Babylon in 609 B. C. He met and defeated Josiah at Megiddo. He then marched on northward. In three months he marched back to Egypt, having accomplished nothing against Babylon. The interval, 609 to 605 B. C., was the opportunity for Nebuchadnezzar. He secured as allies or as subjects the various tribes in Palestine, as appears from Berosus. Among the rest "Jehoiakim (2 Kings 24:1) became his servant three years". During that time he took as guests or as hostages the noble youths. At the end of the three years, in 605, Necho re-appeared on his way to fatal Carchemish. Jehoiakim renounced Nebuchadnezzar, and sided with Necho. A merciful Providence counted the seventy years captivity from the very first deportation and Daniel tells us when that was. The captivity ended in 536 B. C.

(10) *The Aramaic.* One critic said Aramaic was not spoken in Babylon. Others, not so self-confident, said the Aramaic in Babylon was different from Daniel's Aramaic. None of them knew what Aramaic was spoken in Babylon. There was Ezra's Aramaic. It was like Daniel's and Ezra was a native of Babylon. To save their argument they then post-dated Ezra too.

In 1906 and 1908, there were unearthed papyrus rolls in Aramaic written in the fifth century, B. C. It is impossible to suggest redactors and other imaginary persons in this case, and so the Aramaic argument goes the way of all the rest. Before these recent finds the Aramaic weapon had begun to lose its potency. The clay tablets, thousands of which have been found in Babylonia, are legal documents and are written in Babylonian. Upon the backs of some of them were Aramaic filing marks stating in brief the contents. These filings were for ready reference and evidently in the common language of the people, the same language which the frightened Chaldeans used when the angry monarch threatened them. (Dan. 2:4.)

There are some other alleged inaccuracies more frivolous than the above. Lack of space forbids their consideration here.

Two new objections to the genuineness of Daniel appear in a dictionary of the Bible, edited by three American clergymen. The article on Daniel states that "the BABA BATHRA* *ascribes the writing not to Daniel but along with that of some other books to the men of the Great Synagogue".* THIS STATEMENT IS CORRECT IN WORDS, BUT BY CONCEALMENT CONVEYS A FALSE IMPRESSION. The trick lies in the phrase, "some other books". What are those other books? They are Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos—all the minor prophets—and Esther. The

*The passage is found in the Talmud Babylon, Tract Baba Bathra, fol. 15a., and reads, "The men of the Great Synagogue have written Ezekiel, the Twelve Minor Prophets, Daniel and Esther."—Editor.

statement itself is nonsensical, like many other things in the Talmud, but whatever its meaning, it places Daniel on the same footing as Ezekiel and the rest.

The other objection is as follows: "Chapter 11 [of Daniel] with its four world-kingdoms is wonderfully cleared when viewed from this standpoint [i. e. as a Maccabean production]. The third of these kingdoms is explicitly named as the Persian. (11:2.) The fourth to follow is evidently the Greek".

Every phrase in this is false. The chapter says nothing about four world-kingdoms. Nor does 11:2 say explicitly, or any other way, that the Persian was the third; nor that the Greek was the fourth.

No explanation or modification of these astonishing statements is offered. How could the writer expect to escape detection? True, the Baba Bathra is inaccessible to most people, but Daniel 11 is in everybody's hands.

Daniel was a wise and well-known man in the time of Ezekiel, else all point in the irony of Ezek. 28:3 is lost. He was also eminent for goodness and must have been esteemed an especial recipient of God's favor and to have had intercourse with the Most High like Noah and Job. Ezek. 14:15, 20: "When the land sinneth, though Noah, Daniel and Job were in it, they shall deliver but their own souls". A striking collocation: Noah the second father of the race, Job the Gentile and Daniel the Jew.

Daniel is better attested than any other book of the Old Testament. Ezekiel mentions the man. Zechariah appears to have read the book. The bungling attempt of the Septuagint to alter a prediction of disaster to one of promise; our Saviour's recognition of Daniel as a prophet; these are attestations. Compare Ezekiel; there is not a word in the Bible to show that he ever existed, but as he does not plainly predict the Saviour no voice is raised or pen wagged against him.

CHAPTER XIV

THE DOCTRINAL VALUE OF THE FIRST CHAPTERS OF GENESIS

BY THE REV. DYSON HAGUE, M. A.,
VICAR OF THE CHURCH OF THE EPIPHANY; PROFESSOR OF LITURGICS, WYCLIFFE COLLEGE, TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA

The Book of Genesis is in many respects the most important book in the Bible. It is of the first importance because it answers, not exhaustively, but sufficiently, the fundamental questions of the human mind. It contains the first authoritative information given to the race concerning these questions of everlasting interest: the Being of God; the origin of the universe; the creation of man; the origin of the soul; the fact of revelation; the introduction of sin; the promise of salvation; the primitive division of the human race; the purpose of the elected people; the preliminary part in the program of Christianity. In one word, in this inspired volume of beginnings, we have the satisfactory explanation of all the sin and misery and contradiction now in this world, and the reason of the scheme of redemption.

Or, to put it in another way. The Book of Genesis is the seed in which the plant of God's Word is enfolded. It is the starting point of God's gradually-unfolded plan of the ages. Genesis is the plinth of the pillar of the Divine revelation. It is the root of the tree of the inspired Scriptures. It is the source of the stream of the holy writings of the Bible. If the base of the pillar is removed, the pillar falls. If the root of the tree is cut out, the tree will wither and die. If the fountain head of the stream is cut off, the stream will dry up. The Bible as a whole is like a chain hanging upon two staples. The Book of Genesis is the one staple; the Book of Revelation is the other. Take away

either staple, the chain falls in confusion. If the first chapters of Genesis are unreliable, the revelation of the beginning of the universe, the origin of the race, and the reason of its redemption are gone. If the last chapters of Revelation are displaced the consummation of all things is unknown. If you take away Genesis, you have lost the explanation of the first heaven, the first earth, the first Adam, and the fall. If you take away Revelation you have lost the completed truth of the new heaven, and the new earth, man redeemed, and the second Adam in Paradise regained.

Further: in the first chapters of the Book of Genesis, you have the strong and sufficient foundation of the subsequent developments of the kingdom of God; the root-germ of all Anthropology, Soteriology, Christology, Satanology, to say nothing of the ancient and modern problems of the mystery and culpability of sin, the Divine ordinance of the Lord's Day, the unity of the race, and God's establishment of matrimony and the family life.

We assume from the start the historicity of Genesis and its Mosaic authorship. It was evidently accepted by Christ the Infallible, our Lord and God, as historical, as one single composition, and as the work of Moses. It was accepted by Paul the inspired. It was accepted universally by the divinely inspired leaders of God's chosen people. (See Green's "Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch.") It has validated itself to the universal Church throughout the ages by its realism and consistency, and by what has been finely termed its subjective truthfulness. We postulate especially the historicity of the first chapters. These are not only valuable, they are vital. They are the essence of Genesis. The Book of Genesis is neither the work of a theorist or a tribal annalist. It is still less the product of some anonymous compiler or compilers in some unknowable era, of a series of myths, historic in form but unhistoric in fact. Its opening is an apocalypse, a direct revelation from the God of all truth. Whether it was given

in a vision or otherwise, it would be impossible to say. But it is possible, if not probable, that the same Lord God, who revealed to His servant as he was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day the apocalypse of the humanly unknown and unknowable events of man's history which will transpire when this heaven and this earth have passed away, would also have revealed to His servant, being in the Spirit, the apocalypse of the humanly unknowable and unknown events which transpired before this earth's history began. It has been asserted that the beginning and the end of things are both absolutely hidden from science. Science has to do with phenomena. It is where science must confess its impotence that revelation steps in, and, with the authority of God, reveals those things that are above it. The beginning of Genesis, therefore, is a divinely inspired narrative of the events deemed necessary by God to establish the foundations for the Divine Law in the sphere of human life, and to set forth the relation between the omnipotent Creator and the man who fell, and the race that was to be redeemed by the incarnation of His Son.

The German rationalistic idea, which has passed over into thousands of more or less orthodox Christian minds, is that these earliest chapters embody ancient traditions of the Semitic-oriental mind. Others go farther, and not only deny them to be the product of the reverent and religious mind of the Hebrew, but assert they were simply oriental legends, not born from above and of God, but born in the East, and probably in pagan Babylonia.

We would therefore postulate the following propositions:

1. The Book of Genesis has no doctrinal value if it is not authoritative.

2. The Book of Genesis is not authoritative if it is not true. For if it is not history, it is not reliable; and if it is not revelation, it is not authoritative.

3. The Book of Genesis is not true if it is not from God. For if it is not from God, it is not inspired; and if it

is not inspired, it possesses to us no doctrinal value whatever.

4. The Book of Genesis is not direct from God if it is a heterogeneous compilation of mythological folklore by unknowable writers.

5. If the Book of Genesis is a legendary narrative, anonymous, indefinitely erroneous, and the persons it described the mere mythical personifications of tribal genius, it is of course not only non-authentic, because non-authenticated, but an insufficient basis for doctrine. The residuum of dubious truth, which might with varying degrees of consent be extracted therefrom, could never be accepted as a foundation for the superstructure of eternally trustworthy doctrine, for it is an axiom that that only is of doctrinal value which is God's Word. Mythical and legendary fiction, and still more, erroneous and misleading tradition, are incompatible not only with the character of the God of all truth, but with the truthfulness, trustworthiness, and absolute authority of the Word of God. We have not taken for our credentials cleverly invented myths. The primary documents, if there were such, were collated and revised and re-written by Moses by inspiration of God.

A sentence in Margoliouth's "Lines of Defence" deserves an attentive consideration today. We should have some opportunity, said the Oxford professor, of gauging the skill of those on whose faith the old-fashioned belief in the authenticity of Scripture has been abandoned. (p. 293.) One would perhaps prefer to put the idea in this way. Our modern Christians should have more opportunity not only of appraising the skill, but of gauging also the spiritual qualifications of a critical school that has been characterized notoriously by an enthusiasm against the miraculous, and a precipitate adoption of any conclusion from a rationalistic source which militates against the historicity of Genesis.

Christians are conceding too much nowadays to the agnostic scientist, and the rationalistic Hebraist, and are often to blame

if they allow them to go out of their specific provinces without protest. Their assumptions ought to be watched with the utmost vigilance and jealousy. (See Gladstone, "The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture," pp. 62-83.)

But to resume. The Book of Genesis is the foundation on which the superstructure of the Scriptures rests. The foundation of the foundation is the first three chapters, which form in themselves a complete monograph of revelation. And of this final substructure the first three verses of the first chapter are the foundation.

In the first verse of Genesis in words of supernatural grandeur, we have a revelation of God as the first cause, the Creator of the universe, the world and man. The glorious Being of God comes forth without explanation, and without apology. It is a revelation of the one, personal, living, God. There is in the ancient philosophic cosmogony no trace of the idea of such a Being, still less of such a Creator, for all other systems began and ended with pantheistic, materialistic, or hylozoistic conceptions. The Divine Word stands unique in declaring the absolute idea of the living God, without attempt at demonstration. The spirituality, infinity, omnipotence, sanctity of the Divine Being, all in germ lie here. Nay more. The later and more fully revealed doctrine of the unity of God in the Trinity may be said to lie here in germ also, and the last and deepest revelation to be involved in first and foremost. The fact of God in the first of Genesis is not given as a deduction of reason or a philosophic generalization. It is a revelation. It is a revelation of that primary truth which is received by the universal human mind as a truth that needs no proof, and is incapable of it, but which being received, is verified to the intelligent mind by an irresistible force not only with ontological and cosmological, but with teleological and moral arguments. Here we have in this first verse of Genesis, not only a postulate apart from Revelation, but three great truths which have constituted the glory of our religion.

(1) The Unity of God; in contradiction to all the polytheisms and dualisms of ancient and modern pagan philosophy.

(2) The Personality of God; in contradiction to that pantheism whether materialistic or idealistic, which recognizes God's immanence in the world, but denies His transcendence. For in all its multitudinous developments, pantheism has this peculiarity, that it denies the personality of God, and excludes from the realm of life the need of a Mediator, a Sin-Bearer, and a personal Saviour.

(3) The Omnipotence of God; in contradiction, not only to those debasing conceptions of the anthropomorphic deities of the ancient world, but to all those man-made idols which the millions of heathenism today adore. God made these stars and suns, which man in his infatuation fain would worship. Thus in contradiction to all human conceptions and human evolutions, there stands forth no mere deistic abstraction, but the one, true, living and only God. He is named by the name Elohim, the name of Divine Majesty, the Adorable One, our Creator and Governor; the same God who in a few verses later is revealed as Jehovah-Elohim, Jehovah being the Covenant name, the God of revelation and grace, the Ever-Existent Lord, the God and Father of us all. (Green, "Unity of Genesis," pp. 31, 32; "Fausset's Bib. Ency.," p. 258.)

One of the theories of modernism is that the law of evolution can be traced through the Bible in the development of the idea of God. The development of the idea of God? Is there in the Scriptures any real trace of the development of the idea of God? There is an expansive, and richer, and fuller revelation of the attributes and dealings and ways and workings of God; but not of the idea of God. The God of Gen. 1:1 is the God of Psa. 90; of Isa. 40:28; of Heb. 1:1; and Rev. 4:11.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Here in a sublime revelation is the doctrinal foundation of the creation of the universe, and the contradiction of the an-

cient and modern conceptions of the eternity of matter. God only is eternal.

One can well believe the story of a Japanese thinker who took up a strange book, and with wonderment read the first sentence: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." It struck him that there was more philosophy of a theological character, and satisfying to the mind and soul, in that one sentence than in all the sacred books of the orient.

That single sentence separates the Scriptures from the rest of human productions. The wisest philosophy of the ancients, Platonic-Aristotelian or Gnostic, never reached the point that the world was created by God in the sense of absolute creation. In no cosmogony outside of the Bible is there a record of the idea that God created the heaven and the earth, as an effort of His will, and the fiat of His eternal, self-existent Personality. *Ex nihilo nihil fit.* The highest point reached by their philosophical speculations was a kind of atomic theory; of cosmic atoms and germs and eggs possessed of some inexplicable forces of development, out of which the present cosmos was through long ages evolved. Matter was almost universally believed to have existed from eternity. The Bible teaches that the universe was not *causa sui* or a mere passive evolution of His nature, nor a mere transition from one form of being to another, from non-being to being, but that it was a direct creation of the personal, living, working God, who created all things out of nothing, but the fiat of His will, and the instrumentality of the eternal Logos. In glorious contrast to agnostic science with its lamentable creed, "I believe that behind and above and around the phenomena of matter and force remains the unsolved mystery of the universe," the Christian holds forth his triumphant solution, "I believe that in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." (John 1; 1-3; Heb. 1:1; Col. 1:16.) The first verse of the Bible is a proof that the Book is of God.

And so with regard to the subsequent verses. Genesis is admittedly not a scientific history. It is a narrative for mankind to show that this world was made by God for the habitation of man, and was gradually being fitted for God's children. So in a series of successive creative developments from the formless chaos, containing in embryonic condition all elemental constituents, chemical and mechanical, air, earth, fire, and water, the sublime process is recorded, according to the Genesis narrative in the following order:

1. The creation by direct Divine act of matter in its gaseous, aqueous, terrestrial and mineral condition successively. (Gen. 1:1-10; cf. Col. 1:16; Heb. 11:3.)

2. The emergence by Divine creative power of the lowest forms of sea and land life. (Gen. 1:11-13.)

3. The creation by direct Divine act of larger forms of life, aquatic and terrestrial; the great sea monsters and gigantic reptiles (the sheretjim and tanninim). (Dawson, "Origin of the World," p. 213; Gen. 1:20-21.)

4. The emergence by Divine creative power of land animals of higher organization, herbivora and smaller mammals and carnivora. (Gen. 1:24-25.)

5. And finally the creation by direct Divine act of man. (Gen. 1:26, 27.) Not first but last. The last for which the first was made, as Browning so finely puts it. Herein is the compatability of Genesis and science, for this sublime order is just the order that some of the foremost of the nineteenth and twentieth century scientists have proclaimed. It is remarkable, too, that the word for absolutely new creation is only used in connection with the introduction of life. (Gen. 1:1, 2, 27.) These three points where the idea of absolute creation is introduced are the three main points at which modern champions of evolution find it impossible to make their connection.

Next we have in this sublime revelation the doctrinal foundation for the beginning of mankind.

Man was created, not evolved. That is, he did not come from protoplasmic mud-mass, or sea ooze bathybian, or by descent from fish or frog, or horse, or ape; but at once, direct, full made, did man come forth from God. When you read what some writers, professedly religious, say about man and his bestial origin your shoulders unconsciously droop; your head hangs down; your heart feels sick. Your self-respect has received a blow. When you read Genesis, your shoulders straighten, your chest emerges. You feel proud to be that thing that is called man. Up goes your heart, and up goes your head. The Bible stands openly against the evolutionary development of man, and his gradual ascent through indefinite aeons from the animal. Not against the idea of the development of the plans of the Creator in nature, or a variation of species by means of environment and processes of time. That is seen in Genesis, and throughout the Bible, and in this world. But the Bible does stand plainly against that garish theory that all species, vegetable and animal, have originated through evolution from lower forms through long natural processes. The materialistic form of this theory to the Christian is most offensive. It practically substitutes an all-engendering protoplasmic call for the only and true God. But even the theistic-supernaturalistic theory is opposed to the Bible and to Science for these reasons.

1. There is no such universal law of development. On the contrary, scientific evidence is now standing for deterioration. The flora and the fauna of the latest period show no trace of improvement, and even man, proud man, from the biological and physiological standpoint has gained nothing to speak of from the dawn of history. The earliest archæological remains of Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, show no trace of slow emergence from barbarism. That species can be artificially improved is true, but that is not transmutation of species. (Dawson, "Origin of the World," pp. 227-277.)

2. No new type has ever been discovered. Science is

universally proclaiming the truth of Gen. 1:11, 12, 21, 24, 25 "after his kind," "after their kind"; that is, species by species. Geology with its five hundred or so species of ganoids proclaims the fact of the non-transmutation of species. If, as they say, the strata tell the story of countless aeons, it is strange that during those countless aeons the trilobite never produced anything but a trilobite, nor has the ammonite ever produced anything but an ammonite. The elaborately artificial exceptions of modern science only confirm the rule. (See Townsend, "Collapse of Evolution.")

3. Nor is there any trace of transmutation of species. Man develops from a single cell, and the cell of a monkey is said to be indistinguishable from that of a man. But the fact that a man cell develops into a man and the monkey cell develops into a monkey, shows there is an immeasurable difference between them. And the development from a cell into a man has nothing whatever to do with the evolution of one species into another. "To science, species are practically unchangeable units" ("Origin of the World," p. 227). Man is the sole species of his genus, and the sole representative of his species. The abandonment of any original type is said to be soon followed by the complete extinction of the family.

4. Nor has the missing link been found. The late Robert Etheridge of the British Museum, head of the geological department, and one of the ablest of British paleontologists, has said: "In all that great museum there is not a particle of evidence of transmutation of species. Nine-tenths of the talk of evolutionists is not founded on observation, and is wholly unsupported by facts." And Professor Virchow is said to have declared with vehemence regarding evolution: "It's all nonsense. You are as far as ever you were from establishing any connection between man and the ape." A great gulf is fixed between the theory of evolution and the sublime statement of Gen. 1:26, 27. These verses give man his true place in the universe as the consummation of creation. Made out of the

dust of the ground, and created on the same day with the highest group of animals, man has physiological affinities with the animal creation. But he was made in the image of God, and therefore transcendently superior to any animal. "Man is a walker, the monkey is a climber," said the great French scientist, De Quatrefages, years ago. A man does a thousand things every day that a monkey could not do if he tried ten thousand years. Man has the designing, controlling, ordering, constructive, and governing faculties. Man has personality, understanding, will, conscience. Man is fitted for apprehending God, and for worshipping God. The Genesis account of man is the only possible basis of revelation. The revelation of fatherhood; of the beautiful, the true, the good; of purity, of peace; is unthinkable to a horse, a dog, or a monkey. The most civilized simian could have no affinity with such ideas. There is no possibility of his conceiving such conceptions, or of receiving them if revealed. It is, moreover, the only rational basis for the doctrine of regeneration in opposition to the idea of the evolution of the human character, and of the great doctrine of the incarnation. Man once made in the image of God, by the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost is born again and made in the image of God the Son.

Further, we have in this sublime revelation of Genesis the doctrinal foundation of—

1. The unity of the human race.
2. The fall of man.
3. The plan of redemption.

1. With regard to the first, Sir William Dawson has said that the Bible knows but one Adam. Adam was not a myth, or an ethnic name. He was a veritable man, made by God; not an evolutionary development from some hairy anthropoid in some imaginary continent of Lemuria. The Bible knows but one species of man, one primitive pair. This is confirmed by the Lord Jesus Christ in Matt. 19:4. It is re-affirmed

by Paul in Acts 17:26, whichever reading may be taken, and in Rom. 5:12; 1 Cor. 15:21, 47, 49. Nor is there any ground for supposing that the word Adam is used in a collective sense, and thus leave room for the hypotheses of the evolutionary development of a large number of human pairs. All things in both physiology and ethnology, as well as in the sciences, which bear on the subject, confirm the idea of the unity of the human race. (Saphir, p. 206.)

2. With regard to the fall of man. The foundation of all Hamartology and Anthropology lies in the first three chapters of Genesis. It teaches us that man was originally created for communion with God, and that whether his personality was dichotomistic or trichotomistic, he was entirely fitted for personal, intelligent fellowship with his Maker, and was united with Him in the bonds of love and knowledge. Every element of the Bible story recommends itself as a historic narrative. Placed in Eden by his God, with a work to do, and a trial-command, man was potentially perfect, but with the possibility of fall. Man fell, though it was God's will that man should rise from that human *posse non peccari* as a free agent into the Divine *non posse peccari.* (Augustine, "De Civitate Dei", Book 22, Chap. 30.) Man fell by disobedience, and through the power of a supernatural deceiver called that old serpent, the devil and Satan, who from Gen. 3 to Rev. 19 appears as the implacable enemy of the human race, and the head of that fallen angel-band which abandoned through the sin of pride their first principality.

This story is incomprehensible if only a myth. The great Dutch theologian, Van Oosterzee says, "The narrative presents itself plainly as history. Such an historico-fantastic clothing of a pure philosophic idea accords little with the genuine spirit of Jewish antiquity." (Dog. ii, p. 403.)

Still more incomprehensible is it, if it is merely an allegory which refers fruit, serpent, woman, tree, eating, etc., to entirely different things from those mentioned in the Bible. It

is history. It is treated as such by our Lord Jesus Christ, who surely would not mistake a myth for history, and by St. Paul, who hardly built Rom. 5, and 1 Cor. 15, on cleverly composed fables. It is the only satisfactory explanation of the corruption of the race. From Adam's time death has reigned.

This story of the fall stands, moreover, as a barrier against all Manicheism, and against that Pelagianism which declares that man is not so bad after all, and derides the doctrine of original sin which in all our Church confessions distinctly declares the possession by every one from birth of this sinful nature. (See, e. g., Art. IX of "Anglican Church.") The penalty and horror of sin, the corruption of our human nature, and the hopelessness of our sinful estate are things definitely set forth in the Holy Scripture, and are St. Paul's divinely-inspired deductions from this fact of the incoming of sin and death through the disobedience and fall of Adam, the original head of the human race. The race is in a sinful condition. (Rom. 5:12.) Mankind is a solidarity. As the root of a tree lives in stem, branch, leaf and fruit; so in Adam, as Anselm says, a person made nature sinful, in his posterity nature made persons sinful. Or, as Pascal finely puts it, original sin is folly in the sight of man, but this folly is wiser than all the wisdom of man. For without it, who could have said what man is. His whole condition depends upon this imperceptible point. ("Thoughts," ch. xiii-11.) This Genesis story further is the foundation of the Scripture doctrine of all human responsiblity, and accountability to God. A lowered anthropology always means a lowered theology, for if man was not a direct creation of God, if he was a mere indirect development, through slow and painful process, of no one knows what, or how, or why, or when, or where, the main spring of moral accountability is gone. The fatalistic conception of man's personal and moral life is the deadly gift of naturalistic evolution to our age, said Prof. D. A. Curtis recently.

3. With regard to our redemption, the third chapter of Genesis is the basis of all Soteriology. If there was no fall, there was no condemnation, no separation and no need of reconciliation. If there was no need of reconciliation, there was no need of redemption; and if there was no need of redemption, the Incarnation was a superfluity, and the crucifixion folly. (Gal. 3:21.) So closely does the apostle link the fall of Adam and the death of Christ, that without Adam's fall the science of theology is evacuated of its most salient feature, the atonement. If the first Adam was not made a living soul and fell, there was no reason for the work of the Second Man, the Lord from heaven. The rejection of the Genesis story as a myth, tends to the rejection of the Gospel of salvation. One of the chief corner stones of the Christian doctrine is removed, if the historical reality of Adam and Eve is abandoned, for the fall will ever remain as the starting point of special revelation, of salvation by grace, and of the need of personal regeneration. In it lies the germ of the entire apostolic Gospel.

Finally, we have in Gen. 2 the doctrinal foundation of those great fundamentals, the necessity of labor, the Lord's Day of rest, the Divine ordinance of matrimony, and the home life of mankind. The weekly day of rest was provided for man by his God, and is planted in the very forefront of revelation as a Divine ordinance, and so also is marriage and the home. Our Lord Jesus Christ endorses the Mosaic story of the creation of Adam and Eve, refers to it as the explanation of the Divine will regarding divorce, and sanctions by His infallible *imprimatur* that most momentous of ethical questions, monogamy. Thus the great elements of life as God intended it, the three universal factors of happy, healthy, helpful life, law, labor, love, are laid down in the beginning of God's Book.

Three other remarkable features in the first chapters of Genesis deserve a brief reference.

The first is the assertion of the original unity of the language of the human race. (Gen. 11:1.) Max Muller, a foremost ethnologist and philologist, declares that all our languages, in spite of their diversities, must have originated in one common source. (See Saphir, "Divine Unity," p. 206; Dawson, "Origin of the World," p. 286; Guinness, "Divine Programme," p. 75.)

The second is that miracle of ethnological prophecy by Noah in Gen. 9:26, 27, in which we have foretold in a sublime epitome the three great divisions of the human race, and their ultimate historic destinies. The three great divisions, Hamitic, Shemitic, and Japhetic, are the three ethnic groups into which modern science has divided the human race. The facts of history have fulfilled what was foretold in Genesis four thousand years ago. The Hamitic nations, including the Chaldean, Babylonic, and Egyptian, have been degraded, profane, and sensual. The Shemitic have been the religious with the line of the coming Messiah. The Japhetic have been the enlarging, and the dominant races, including all the great world monarchies, both of the ancient and modern times, the Grecian, Roman, Gothic, Celtic, Teutonic, British and American, and by recent investigation and discovery, the races of India, China, and Japan. Thus Ham lost all empire centuries ago; Shem and his race acquired it ethically and spiritually through the Prophet, Priest and King, the Messiah; while Japheth, in world-embracing enlargement and imperial supremacy, has stood for industrial, commercial, and political dominion.

The third is the glorious promise given to Abraham, the man to whom the God of glory appeared and in whose seed, personal and incarnate, the whole world was to be blessed. Abraham's personality is the explanation of the monotheism of the three greatest religions in the world. He stands out in majestic proportion, as Max Muller says, as a figure, second only to One in the whole world's history. Apart from that

promise the miraculous history of the Hebrew race is inexplicable. In him centers, and on him hangs, the central fact of the whole of the Old Testament, the promise of the Saviour and His glorious salvation. (Gen. 11:3; 22:18; Gal. 3:8-16.)

In an age, therefore, when the critics are waxing bold in claiming settledness for the assured results of their hypothetic eccentricities, Christians should wax bolder in contending earnestly for the assured results of the revelation in the opening chapters of Genesis.

The attempt of modernism to save the supernatural in the second part of the Bible by mythicalizing the supernatural in the first part, is as unwise as it is fatal. Instead of lowering the dominant of faith amidst the chorus of doubt, and admitting that a chapter is doubtful because some *doctrinaire* has questioned it, or a doctrine is less authentic because somebody has floated an unverifiable hypothesis, it would be better to take our stand with such men as Romanes, Lord Kelvin, Virchow, and Liebig, in their ideas of a Creative Power, and to side with Cuvier, the eminent French scientist, who said that Moses, while brought up in all the science of Egypt, was superior to his age, and has left us a cosmogony, the exactitude of which verifies itself every day in a reasonable manner; with Sir William Dawson, the eminent Canadian scientist, who declared that Scripture in all its details contradicts no received result of science, but anticipates many of its discoveries; with Professor Dana, the eminent American scientist, who said, after examining the first chapters of Genesis as a geologist, "I find it to be in perfect accord with known science"; or, best of all, with Him who said, "Had you believed Moses, you would have believed Me, for he wrote of Me. But if you believe not his writings, how shall you believe My words?" (John 5:45, 46.)

CHAPTER XV

THREE PECULIARITIES OF THE PENTATEUCH WHICH ARE INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE GRAF-WELLHAUSEN THEORIES OF ITS COMPOSITION

BY ANDREW CRAIG ROBINSON, M. A.,
BALLINEEN, COUNTY CORK, IRELAND,
AUTHOR OF "WHAT ABOUT THE OLD TESTAMENT?"

There are—amongst others—three very remarkable peculiarities in the Pentateuch which seem to be incompatible with modern theories of its composition, and to call for some explanation from the critics.

The first of these peculiarities is:

THE ABSENCE OF THE NAME "JERUSALEM" FROM THE ENTATEUCH

The first occurrence of the name "Jerusalem" in the Bible is in the Book of Joshua (10:1): "Now it came to pass when Adonizedek, King of Jerusalem", etc. In the Pentateuch the city is only once named (Gen. 14) and then it is called "Salem" —an abbreviation of its cuneiform name "Uru-salem". Now on the traditional view of the Pentateuch the absence of the name Jerusalem presents no difficulty; the fact that Bethel, Hebron, and other shrines are named, whilst Jerusalem is not, would merely mean that at these other shrines the patriarchs had built their altars, whilst at Jerusalem they had not.

But from the point of view of modern critics who hold that the Pentateuch was in great part composed to glorify the priesthood at Jerusalem, and that the Book of Deuteronomy in particular was produced to establish Jerusalem as the central and only acceptable shrine for the worship of

Israel—this omission to name the great city, then of historic and sacred fame, which they wished to exalt and glorify, seems very strange indeed. According to the theories of the critics the composers of the Pentateuch had a very free hand to write whatsoever they wished, and they are held to have freely exercised it. It seems strange then to find the "Yahvist," supposed to have been written in the Southern Kingdom, and to have been imbued with all its prejudices, consecrating Bethel by a notable theophany (Gen. 28:16, 19), whilst in all that he is supposed to have written in the Pentateuch he never once even names his own Jerusalem. And so the "priestly writer" also, to whom a shrine like Bethel ought to be anathema, is found nevertheless consecrating Bethel with another theophany: "Jacob called the name of the place where God spoke with him Bethel" (Gen. 35:14, 15), and he never even names Jerusalem.

What is the explanation of all this? What is the inner meaning of this absence of the name Jerusalem from the Pentateuch? Is it not this: that at the time the Pentateuch was written, Jerusalem, with all her sacred glories, *had not entered yet into the life of Israel.*

The second remarkable peculiarity to which attention is called is:

THE ABSENCE OF ANY MENTION OF SACRED SONG FROM THE RITUAL OF THE PENTATEUCH

This is in glaring contrast to the ritual of the second temple, in which timbrels, harps, and Levite singers bore a conspicuous part. Yet it was just in the very time of the second temple that the critics allege that a great portion of the Pentateuch was composed. How is it then that none of these things occur in the Mosaic ritual? It might have been expected that the priests in post-exilic times would have sought to establish the highest possible sanction for this musical ritual, by representing it as having been ordained by Moses.

But no such ordinance in point of fact occurs, and the Pentateuch stands in its primitive simplicity, destitute of any ordinance of music in connection with the ritual, except those passages in which the blowing of the trumpets is enjoined at the Feast of Trumpets, the blowing of the trumpet throughout the land in the year of Jubilee, and the command, contained in a single passage (Num. 10:10), that in the day of gladness, and in the beginnings of the months, over the burnt offerings and over the sacrifices of the peace offerings the silver trumpets were to sound. No mention in connection with the ritual of cymbals, harps, timbrels, or psalteries; no mention of sacred song, or Levite singers. No music proper entered into the ritual, only the crude and warlike blare of trumpets. No ordinance of sacred song, no band of Levite singers. The duties of the Levites, in the Book of Numbers, are specially defined. The sons of Gershom were to bear the tabernacle and its hangings on the march; the sons of Kohath bore the altars and the sacred vessels; the sons of Merari were to bear the boards and bands and pillars of the sanctuary. No mention whatsoever of any ministry of sacred song. A strange omission this would be, if the "Priestly Code" (so-called) which thus defines the duties of the Levites, had been composed in post-exilic times, when Levite singers—sons of Asaph—cymbals, harp, and song of praise formed leading features in the ritual. Does it not seem that the Mosaic Code, enjoining no music but the simple sounding of the trumpet-blast, *stands far behind* these niceties of music and of song, *seeming to know nothing of them all?*

The third remarkable peculiarity to which attention is called is:

THE ABSENCE OF THE DIVINE TITLE "LORD OF HOSTS" FROM THE PENTATEUCH

The first occurrence of this Divine title in the Bible is in 1 Sam. 1:3: "And this man went out of his city yearly to

worship and to sacrifice unto the Lord of hosts in Shiloh." After this it occurs in a number of the remaining books of the Bible, and with increasing frequency. The pre-Samuelitic period of the history of Israel is thus differentiated from the post-Samuelitic period by this circumstance, that in connection with the former period this title is never used, whilst in connection with the latter it is used, and with growing frequency—at all stages of the history, even down to the end of the Book of Malachi; occurring altogether 281 times.

Now the theory of the criticism of the present day is that the Pentateuch was composed, edited, and manipulated, during a period of more than four hundred years, by motley groups and series of writers, of differing views, and various tendencies. One writer composed one part, and one composed another; these parts were united by a different hand; and then another composed a further part; and this by yet another was united to the two that went before; and after this another portion was composed by yet another scribe, and afterwards was joined on to the three. Matter was absorbed, interpolated, harmonized, smoothed over, colored, edited from various points of view, and with different—not to say opposing—motives. And yet when the completed product—the Pentateuch—coming out of this curious literary seething pot is examined, it is found to have this remarkable characteristic, that not one of the manifold manipulators—neither "J", nor "E", nor "JE", nor "D", nor "RD", nor "P", nor "P2", nor "P3", nor "P4", nor any one of the "Redactors of P", who were innumerable—would appear to have allowed himself to be betrayed even by accident into using this title, "Lord of hosts", so much in vogue in the days in which he is supposed to have written; and the Pentateuch, devoid as it is of this expression, shows an unmistakable mark that it could not possibly have been composed in the way asserted by the criticism, because it would have been a literary impossibility for such a number of writers, extending over hundreds of years, to have one

and all, never even by accident, slipped into the use of this Divine title for Jehovah, "Lord of hosts", so much in vogue during those centuries.

In point of fact the Pentateuch *was written before the title was invented.*

These three peculiarities of the Pentateuch to which attention is here drawn, are points absolutely undeniable. No one can say that the name "Jerusalem" *does* occur in the Pentateuch; no one can say that any mention of sacred song *does* occur in the ritual of the Pentateuch; and no one can say that the Divine title "Lord of hosts" *does* occur in the Pentateuch.

CHAPTER XVI

THE TESTIMONY OF THE MONUMENTS TO THE TRUTH OF THE SCRIPTURES.

BY PROF. GEORGE FREDERICK WRIGHT, D. D., LL. D.,
OBERLIN COLLEGE.

All history is fragmentary. Each particular fact is the center of an infinite complex of circumstances. No man has intelligence enough to insert a supposititious fact into circumstances not belonging to it and make it exactly fit. This only infinite intelligence could do. A successful forgery, therefore, is impossible if only we have a sufficient number of the original circumstances with which to compare it. It is this principle which gives such importance to the cross-examination of witnesses. If the witness is truthful, the more he is questioned the more perfectly will his testimony be seen to accord with the framework of circumstances into which it is fitted. If false, the more will his falsehood become apparent.

Remarkable opportunities for cross-examining the Old Testament Scriptures have been afforded by the recent uncovering of long-buried monuments in Bible lands and by deciphering the inscriptions upon them. It is the object of this essay to give the results of a sufficient portion of this cross-examination to afford a reasonable test of the competence and honesty of the historians of the Old Testament, and of the faithfulness with which their record has been transmitted to us. But the prescribed limits will not permit the half to be told; while room

is left for an entire essay on the discoveries of the last five years to be treated by another hand, specially competent for the task.

Passing by the monumental evidence which has removed objections to the historical statements of the New Testament, as less needing support, attention will be given first to one of the Old Testament narratives, which is nearest to us in time, and against which the harshest judgments of modern critics have been hurled. We refer to the statements in the Book of Daniel concerning the personality and fate of Belshazzar.

THE IDENTIFICATION OF BELSHAZZAR.

In the fifth chaper of Daniel Belshazzar is called the "son of Nebuchadnezzar," and is said to have been "king" of Babylon and to have been slain on the night in which the city was taken. But according to the other historians he was the son of Nabonidus, who was then king, and who is known to have been out of the city when it was captured, and to have lived some time afterwards.

Here, certainly, there is about as glaring an apparent discrepancy as could be imagined. Indeed, there would seem to be a flat contradiction between profane and sacred historians. But in 1854 Sir Henry Rawlinson found, while excavating in the ruins of Mugheir (identified as the site of the city of Ur, from which Abraham emigrated), inscriptions which stated that when Nabonidus was near the end of his reign he associated with him on the throne his eldest son, Bil-shar-uzzur, and allowed him the royal title, thus making it perfectly credible that Belshazzar should have been in Babylon, as he is said to have been in the Bible, and that he should have been called king, and that he should have perished in the city while Nabonidus survived outside. That he should have been called king while his father was still living is no more strange than that Jehoram should have been appointed by his father, Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, seven years before his father's death

(see 2 Kings 1:17 and 8:16), or that Jotham should have been made king before his father, Uzziah, died of leprosy, though Uzziah is still called king in some of the references to him.

That Belshazzar should have been called son of Nebuchadnezzar is readily accounted for on the supposition that he was his grandson, and there are many things to indicate that Nabonidus married Nebuchadnezzar's daughter, while there is nothing known to the contrary. But if this theory is rejected, there is the natural supposition that in the loose use of terms of relationship common among Oriental people "son" might be applied to one who was simply a successor. In the inscriptions on the monuments of Shalmaneser II., referred to below, Jehu, the *extirpator* of the house of Omri, is called the "son of Omri."

The status of Belshazzar implied in this explanation is confirmed incidentally by the fact that Daniel is promised in verse 6 the "third" place in the kingdom, and in verse 29 is given that place, all of which implies that Belshazzar was second only.

Thus, what was formerly thought to be an insuperable objection to the historical accuracy of the Book of Daniel proves to be, in all reasonable probability, a mark of accuracy. The coincidences are all the more remarkable for being so evidently undesigned.

THE BLACK OBELISK OF SHALMANESER.

From various inscriptions in widely separated places we are now able to trace the movements of Shalmaneser II. through nearly all of his career. In B. C. 842 he crossed the Euphrates for the sixteenth time and carried his conquests to the shores of the Mediterranean. Being opposed by Hazael of Damascus, he overthrew the Syrian army, and pursued it to the royal city and shut it up there, while he devastated the territory surrounding. But while there is no mention of his fighting with the Tyrians, Sidonians, and Israelites, he is said

to have received tribute from them and "from Jehu, the son of Omri." This inscription occurs on the celebrated Black Obelisk discovered many years ago by Sir Henry Rawlinson in the ruins of Nimroud. On it are represented strings of captives with evident Jewish features, in the act of bringing their tribute to the Assyrian king. Now, though there is no mention in the sacred records of any defeat of Jehu by the Assyrians, nor of the paying of tribute by him, it is most natural that tribute should have been paid under the circumstances; for in the period subsequent to the battle of Karkar, Damascus had turned against Israel, so that Israel's most likely method of getting even with Hazael would have been to make terms with his enemy, and pay tribute, as she is said to have done, to Shalmaneser.

THE MOABITE STONE.

One of the most important discoveries, giving reality to Old Testament history, is that of the Moabite Stone, discovered at Dibon, east of the Jordan, in 1868, which was set up by King Mesha (about 850 B. C.) to signalize his deliverance from the yoke of Omri, king of Israel. The inscription is valuable, among other things, for its witness to the civilized condition of the Moabites at that time and to the close similarity of their language to that of the Hebrews. From this inscription we learn that Omri, king of Israel, was compelled by the rebellion of Mesha to resubjugate Moab; and that after doing so, he and his son occupied the cities of Moab for a period of forty years, but that, after a series of battles, it was restored to Moab in the days of Mesha. Whereupon the cities and fortresses retaken were strengthened, and the country repopulated, while the methods of warfare were similar to those practiced by Israel. On comparing this with 2 Kings 3:4-27, we find a parallel account which dovetails in with this in a most remarkable manner, though naturally the biblical narrative treats lightly of the reconquest by Mesha, simply stating

that, on account of the horror created by the idolatrous sacrifice of his eldest son upon the walls before them, the Israelites departed from the land and returned to their own country.

THE EXPEDITION OF SHISHAK.

In the fourteenth chapter of 1 Kings we have a brief account of an expedition of Shishak, king of Egypt, against Jerusalem in the fifth year of Rehoboam. To the humiliation of Judah, it is told that Shishak succeeded in taking away the treasures of the house of Jehovah and of the king's house, among them the shields of gold which Solomon had made; so that Rehoboam made shields of brass in their stead. To this simple, unadorned account there is given a wonderful air of reality as one gazes on the southern wall of the court of the temple of Amen at Karnak and beholds the great expanse of sculptures and hieroglyphics which are there inscribed to represent this campaign of Shishak. One hundred and fifty-six places are enumerated among those which were captured, the northernmost being Megiddo. Among the places are Gaza, Adullam, Beth-Horon, Aijalon, Gibeon, and Juda-Malech, in which Dr. Birch is probably correct in recognizing the sacred city of Jerusalem,—*Malech* being the word for royalty.

ISRAEL IN EGYPT.

The city of Tahpanhes, in Egypt, mentioned by Jeremiah as the place to which the refugees fled to escape from Nebuchadnezzar, was discovered in 1886 in the mound known as Tel Defenneh, in the northeastern portion of the delta, where Mr. Flinders Petrie found not only evidences of the destruction of the palace caused by Nebuchadnezzar, but apparently the very "brick work or pavement" spoken of in Jer. 43:8: "Then came the word of the Lord unto Jeremiah in Tahpanhes, saying, Take great stones in thine hand, and hide them in mortar in the brickwork, which is at the entry of Pharaoh's house in Tahpanhes, in the sight of the men of Judah," adding that

Nebuchadnezzar would "set his throne upon these stones," and "spread his royal pavilion over them."

A brick platform in partial ruins, corresponding to this description, was found by Mr. Petrie adjoining the fort "upon the northwest." In every respect the arrangement corresponded to that indicated in the Book of Jeremiah.

Farther to the north, not a great way from Tahpanhes, on the Tanitic branch of the Nile, at the modern village of San, excavations revealed the ancient Egyptian capital Tanis, which went under the earlier name of Zoan, where the Pharaoh of the oppression frequently made his headquarters. According to the Psalmist, it was in the field of "Zoan" that Moses and Aaron wrought their wonders before Pharaoh; and, according to the Book of Numbers, "Hebron" was built only seven years before Zoan. As Hebron was a place of importance before Abraham's time, it is a matter of much significance that Zoan appears to have been an ancient city which was a favorite dwelling-place of the Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings, who preceded the period of the Exodus, and were likely to be friendly to the Hebrews, thus giving greater credibility to the precise statements made in Numbers, and to the whole narrative of the reception of the patriarchs in Egypt.

The Pharaoh of the Oppression, "who knew not Joseph," is generally supposed to be Rameses II., the third king of the nineteenth dynasty, known among the Greeks as Sesostris, one of the greatest of the Egyptian monarchs. Among his most important expeditions was one directed against the tribes of Palestine and Syria, where, at the battle of Kadesh, east of the Lebanon Mountains, he encountered the Hittites. The encounter ended practically in a drawn battle, after which a treaty of peace was made. But the whole state of things revealed by this campaign and subsequent events shows that Palestine was in substantially the same condition of affairs which was found by the children of Israel when they occupied it shortly after, thus confirming the Scripture account.

This Rameses during his reign of sixty-seven years was among the greatest builders of the Egyptian monarchs. It is estimated that nearly half of the extant temples were built in his reign, among which are those at Karnak, Luxor, Abydos, Memphis, and Bubastis. The great Ramesseum at Thebes is also his work, and his name is found carved on almost every monument in Egypt. His oppression of the children of Israel was but an incident in his remarkable career. While engaged in his Asiatic campaigns he naturally made his headquarters at Bubastis, in the land of Goshen, near where the old canal and the present railroad turn off from the delta toward the Bitter Lakes and the Gulf of Suez. Here the ruins of the temple referred to are of immense extent and include the fragments of innumerable statues and monuments which bear the impress of the great oppressor. At length, also, his mummy has been identified; so that now we have a photograph of it which illustrates in all its lineaments the strong features of his character.

THE STORE CITIES OF PITHOM AND RAMESES.

But most interesting of all, in 1883, there were uncovered, a short distance east of Bubastis, the remains of vast vaults, which had evidently served as receptacles for storing grain preparatory to supplying military and other expeditions setting out for Palestine and the far East. Unwittingly, the engineers of the railroad had named the station Rameses. But from the inscriptions that were found it is seen that its original name was Pithom, and its founder was none other than Rameses II., and it proves to be the very place where it is said in the Bible that the children of Israel "built for Pharaoh store-cities, Pithom and Raamses" (Ex. 1:11), when the Egyptians "made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar and in brick." It was in connection with the building of these cities that the oppression of the children of Israel reached its climax, when they were compelled (after the straw with which the brick

were held together failed) to gather for themselves stubble which should serve the purpose of straw, and finally, when even the stubble failed, to make brick without straw (Ex. 5).

Now, as these store pits at Pithom were uncovered by Mr. Petrie, they were found (unlike anything else in Egypt) to be built with *mortar*. Moreover, the lower layers were built of brick which contained straw, while the middle layers were made of brick in which stubble, instead of straw, had been used in their formation, and the upper layers were of brick made without straw. A more perfect circumstantial confirmation of the Bible account could not be imagined. Every point in the confirmation consists of unexpected discoveries. The use of mortar is elsewhere unknown in Ancient Egypt, as is the peculiar succession in the quality of the brick used in the construction of the walls.

Thus have all Egyptian explorations shown that the writer of the Pentateuch had such familiarity with the country, the civilization, and the history of Egypt as could have been obtained only by intimate, personal experience. The leaf which is here given is in its right place. It could not have been inserted except by a participant in the events, or by direct Divine revelation.

THE HITTITES.

In Joshua 1:4, the country between Lebanon and the Euphrates is called the land of the Hittites. In 2 Sam. 24:6, according to the reading of the Septuagint, the limit of Joab's conquests was that of "the Hittites of Kadesh," which is in Coele Syria, some distance north of the present Baalbeck. Solomon is also said to have imported horses from "the kings of the Hittites"; and when the Syrians were besieging Samaria, according to 2 Kings 7:6, they were alarmed from fear that the king of Israel had hired against them "the kings of the Hittites." These references imply the existence of a strong nation widely spread over the northern part of Syria and the regions beyond. At the same time frequent mention is made

of Hittite families in Palestine itself. It was of a Hittite (Gen. 23:10) that Abraham bought his burying-place at Hebron. Bathsheba, the mother of Solomon, had been the wife of Uriah the Hittite, and Esau had two Hittite wives. Hittites are also mentioned as dwelling with the Jebusites and Amorites in the mountain region of Canaan.

Until the decipherment of the inscriptions on the monuments of Egypt and Assyria, the numerous references in the Bible to this mysterious people were unconfirmed by any other historical authorities, so that many regarded the biblical statements as mythical, and an indication of the general untrustworthiness of biblical history. A prominent English biblical critic declared not many years ago that an alliance between Egypt and the Hittites was as improbable as would be one at the present time between England and the Choctaws. But, alas for the over-confident critic, recent investigations have shown, not only that such an alliance was natural, but that it actually occurred.

From the monuments of Egypt we learn that Thothmes III. of the eighteenth dynasty, in 1470 B. C., marched to the banks of the Euphrates and received tribute from "the Greater Hittites" to the amount of 3,200 pounds of silver and a "great piece of crystal." Seven years later tribute was again sent from "the king of the Greater Hittite land." Later, Amenophis III. and IV. are said, in the Tel el-Amarna tablets, to have been constantly called upon to aid in repelling the attacks of the Hittite king, who came down from the north and intrigued with the disaffected Canaanitish tribes in Palestine; while in B. C. 1343, Rameses the Great attempted to capture the Hittite capital at Kadesh, but was unsuccessful, and came near losing his life in the attempt, extricating himself from an ambuscade only by most heroic deeds of valor. Four years later a treaty of peace was signed between the Hittites and the Egyptians, and a daughter of the Hittite king was given in marriage to Rameses.

The Assyrian monuments also bear abundant testimony to the prominence of the Hittites north and west of the Euphrates, of which the most prominent state was that with its capital at Carchemish, in the time of Tiglath-pileser I., about 1100 B. C. In 854 B. C. Shalmaneser II. included the kings of Israel, of Ammon, and of the Arabs, among the "Hittite" princes whom he had subdued, thus bearing most emphatic testimony to the prominence which they assumed in his estimation.

The cuneiform inscriptions of Armenia also speak of numerous wars with the Hittites, and describe "the land of the Hittites" as extending far westward from the banks of the Euphrates.

Hittite sculptures and inscriptions are now traced in abundance from Kadesh, in Coele Syria, westward to Lydia, in Asia Minor, and northward to the Black Sea beyond Marsovan. Indeed, the extensive ruins of Boghaz-Keui, seventy-five miles southwest of Marsovan, seem to mark the principal capital of the Hittites. Here partial excavations have already revealed sculptures of high artistic order, representing deities, warriors and amazons, together with many hieroglyphs which have not yet been translated. The inscriptions are written in both directions, from left to right, and then below back from right to left. Similar inscriptions are found in numerous other places. No clue to their meaning has yet been found, and even the class of languages to which they belong has not been discovered. But enough is known to show that the Hittites exerted considerable influence upon the later civilization which sprung up in Greece and on the western coasts of Asia Minor. It was through them that the emblem of the winged horse made its way into Europe. The mural crown carved upon the head of some of the goddesses at Boghaz-Keui also passed into Grecian sculpture; while the remarkable lions sculptured over the gate at Mycenae are thought to represent Hittite, rather than Babylonian art.

It is impossible to overestimate the value of this testimony

in confirmation of the correctness of biblical history. It shows conclusively that the silence of profane historians regarding facts stated by the biblical writers is of small account, in face of direct statements made by the biblical historians. All the doubts entertained in former times concerning the accuracy of the numerous biblical statements concerning the Hittites is now seen to be due to our ignorance. It was pure ignorance, not superior knowledge, which led so many to discredit these representations. When shall we learn the inconclusiveness of negative testimony?

THE TEL EL-AMARNA TABLETS.

In 1887 some Arabs discovered a wonderful collection of tablets at Tel el-Amarna, an obscure settlement on the east bank of the Nile, about two hundred miles above Cairo and about as far below Thebes. These tablets were of clay, which had been written over with cuneiform inscriptions, such as are found in Babylonia, and then burnt, so as to be indestructible. When at length the inscriptions were deciphered, it appeared that they were a collection of official letters, which had been sent shortly before 1300 B. C. to the last kings of the eighteenth dynasty.

There were in all about three hundred letters, most of which were from officers of the Egyptian army scattered over Palestine to maintain the Egyptian rule which had been established by the preceding kings, most prominent of whom was Tahutimes III., who flourished about one hundred years earlier. But many of the letters were from the kings and princes of Babylonia. What surprised the world most, however, was that this correspondence was carried on, not in the hieroglyphic script of Egypt, but in the cuneiform script of Babylonia.

All this was partly explained when more became known about the character of the Egyptian king to whom the letters were addressed. His original title was Amenhotep IV., indicating that he was a priest of the sun god who is worshiped

at Thebes. But in his anxiety to introduce a religious reform he changed his name to Aken-Aten,—Aten being the name of the deity worshiped at Heliopolis, near Cairo, where Joseph got his wife. The efforts of Aken-Aten to transform the religious worship of Egypt were prodigious. The more perfectly to accomplish it, he removed his capital from Thebes to Tel el-Amarna, and there collected literary men and artists and architects in great numbers and erected temples and palaces, which, after being buried in the sand with all their treasures for more than three thousand years, were discovered by some wandering Arabs twenty-two years ago.

A number of the longest and most interesting of the letters are those which passed between the courts of Egypt and those of Babylonia. It appears that not only did Aken-Aten marry a daughter of the Babylonian king, but his mother and grandmother were members of the royal family in Babylonia, and also that one of the daughters of the king of Egypt had been sent to Babylonia to become the wife of the king. All this comes out in the letters that passed back and forth relating to the dowry to be bestowed upon these daughters and relating to their health and welfare.

From these letters we learn that, although the king of Babylon had sent his sister to be the wife of the king of Egypt, that was not sufficient. The king of Egypt requested also the daughter of the king of Babylon. This led the king of Babylon to say that he did not know how his sister was treated; in fact, he did not know whether she was alive, for he could not tell whether or not to believe the evidence which came to him. In response, the king of Egypt wrote: "Why don't you send some one who knows your sister, and whom you can trust?" Whereupon the royal correspondents break off into discussions concerning the gifts which are to pass between the two in consideration of their friendship and intimate relations.

Syria and Palestine were at this time also, as at the present day, infested by robbers, and the messengers passing be-

tween these royal houses were occasionally waylaid. Whereupon the one who suffered loss would claim damages from the other if it was in his territory, because he had not properly protected the road. An interesting thing in connection with one of these robberies is that it took place at "Hannathon," one of the border towns mentioned in Josh. 19:14, but of which nothing else was ever known until it appeared in this unexpected manner.

Most of the Tel el-Amarna letters, however, consist of those which were addressed to the king of Egypt (Amenhotep IV.) by his officers who were attempting to hold the Egyptian fortresses in Syria and Palestine against various enemies who were pressing hard upon them. Among these were the Hittites, of whom we hear so much in later times, and who, coming down from the far north, were gradually extending their colonies into Palestine and usurping control over the northern part of the country.

About sixty of the letters are from an officer named Rib-addi, who is most profuse in his expressions of humility and loyalty, addressing the king as "his lord" and "sun," and calling himself the "footstool of the king's feet," and saying that he "prostrates himself seven times seven times at his feet." He complains, however, that he is not properly supported in his efforts to defend the provinces of the king, and is constantly wanting more soldiers, more cavalry, more money, more provisions, more everything. So frequent are his importunities that the king finally tells him that if he will write less and fight more he would be better pleased, and that there would be more hopes of his maintaining his power. But Rib-addi says that he is being betrayed by the "curs" that are surrounding him, who represent the other countries that pretend to be friendly to Egypt, but are not.

From this correspondence, and from letters from the south of Palestine, it is made plain that the Egyptian power was fast losing its hold of the country, thus preparing the way for

the condition of things which prevailed a century or two later, when Joshua took possession of the promised land, and found no resistance except from a number of disorganized tribes then in possession.

In this varied correspondence a large number of places are mentioned with which we are familiar in Bible history, among them Damascus, Sidon, Lachish, Ashkelon, Gaza, Joppa, and Jerusalem. Indeed, several of the letters are written from Jerusalem by one Abd-hiba, who complains that some one is slandering him to the king, charging that he was in revolt against his lord. This, he says, the king ought to know is absurd, from the fact that "neither my father nor my mother appointed me to this place. The strong arm of the king inaugurated me in my father's territory. Why should I commit an offense against my lord, the king?" The argument being that, as his office is not hereditary, but one which is held by the king's favor and appointment, his loyalty should be above question.

A single one of these Jerusalem letters may suffice for an illustration:

"To My Lord the King:—Abd-hiba, your servant. At the feet of my lord the king, seven and seven times I fall. Behold the deed which Milki-il and Suardata have done against the land of my lord the king—they have hired the soldiers of Gazri, of Gimti and of Kilti, and have taken the territory of Rubuti. The territory of the king is lost to Habiri. And now, indeed, a city of the territory of Jerusalem, called Bit-Ninib, one of the cities of the king, has been lost to the people of Kilti. Let the king listen to Abd-hiba, his servant, and send troops that I may bring back the king's land to the king. For if there are no troops, the land of the king will be lost to the Habiri. This is the deed of Suardata and Milki-il * * * [defective], and let the king take care of his land."

The discovery of these Tel el-Amarna letters came like a flash of lightning upon the scholarly world. In this case the overturning of a few spadefuls of earth let in a flood of light

upon the darkest portion of ancient history, and in every way confirmed the Bible story.

As an official letter-writer, Rib-addi has had few equals, and he wrote on material which the more it was burned the longer it lasted. Those who think that a history of Israel could not have been written in Moses' time, and that, if written, it could not have been preserved, are reasoning without due knowledge of the facts. Considering the habits of the time, it would have been well nigh a miracle if Moses and his band of associates coming out of Egypt had not left upon imperishable clay tablets a record of the striking events through which they passed.

ACCURACY OF GEOGRAPHICAL DETAILS.

Many persons doubtless wonder why it is that the Bible so abounds in "uninteresting" lists of names both of persons and places which seem to have no relation to modern times or current events. Such, however, will cease to wonder when they come to see the relation which these lists sustain to our confidence in the trustworthiness of the records containing them. They are like the water-marks in paper, which bear indelible evidence of the time and place of manufacture. If, furthermore, one should contemplate personal explorations in Egypt, Canaan, or Babylonia, he would find that for his purposes the most interesting and important portions of the Bible would be these very lists of the names of persons and places which seemed to encumber the historical books of the Old Testament.

One of the most striking peculiarities of the Bible is the "long look" toward the permanent wants of mankind which is everywhere manifested in its preparation; so that it circulates best in its entirety. No man knows enough to abridge the Bible without impairing its usefulness. The parts which the reviser would cut out as superfluous are sure, very soon, to be found to be "the more necessary." If we find that we have not any use for any portion of the Bible, the reason doubtless

is that we have not lived long enough, or have not had sufficiently wide experience to test its merits in all particulars.

Gezer was an important place in Joshua's time, but it afterward became a heap of ruins, and its location was unknown until 1870, when M. Clermont-Ganneau discovered the site in Tel Jezer, and, on excavating it, found three inscriptions, which on interpretation read "Boundary of Gezer."

Among the places conquered by Joshua one of the most important and difficult to capture was Lachish (Josh. 10:31). This has but recently been identified in Tel el-Hesy, about eighteen miles northeast of Gaza. Extensive excavations, first in 1890 by Dr. Flinders Petrie, and finally by Dr. Bliss, found a succession of ruins, one below the other, the lower foundations of which extended back to about 1700 B. C., some time before the period of conquest, showing at that time a walled city of great strength. In the debris somewhat higher than this there was found a tablet with cuneiform inscriptions corresponding to the Tel el-Amarna tablets, which are known to have been sent to Egypt from this region about 1400 B. C. At a later period, in the time of Sennacherib, Lachish was assaulted and taken by the Assyrian army, and the account of the siege forms one of the most conspicuous scenes on the walls of Sennacherib's palace in Nineveh. These sculptures are now in the British Museum.

Among the places mentioned in the Tel el-Amarna correspondence from which letters were sent to Egypt about 1400 B. C., are Gebal, Beirut, Tyre, Accho (Acre), Hazor, Joppha, Ashkelon, Makkadah, Lachish, Gezer, Jerusalem; while mention is also made of Rabbah, Sarepta, Ashtaroth, Gaza, Gath, Bethshemesh, all of which are familiar names, showing that the Palestine of Joshua is the Palestine known to Egypt in the preceding century. Two hundred years before this (about 1600 B. C.) also, Thothmes III. conquered Palestine, and gives in an inscription the names of more than fifty towns which can be confidently identified with those in the Book of Joshua.

Finally, the forty-two stations named in Num. 33 as camping places for the children of Israel on their way to Palestine, while they cannot all of them be identified, can be determined in sufficient numbers to show that it is not a fictitious list, nor a mere pilgrim's diary, since the scenes of greatest interest, like the region immediately about Mount Sinai, are specially adapted to the great transactions which are recorded as taking place. Besides, it is incredible that a writer of fiction should have encumbered his pages with such a barren catalogue of places. But as part of the great historical movement they are perfectly appropriate.

This conformity of newly discovered facts to the narrative of Sacred Scripture confirms our confidence in the main testimony; just as the consistency of a witness in a cross-examination upon minor and incidental points establishes confidence in his general testimony. The late Sir Walter Besant, in addition to his other literary and philanthropic labors, was for many years secretary of the Palestine Exploration Fund. In reply to the inquiry whether the work of the survey under his direction sustained the historical character of the Old Testament, he says: "To my mind, absolute truth in local details, a thing which cannot possibly be invented, when it is spread over a history covering many centuries, is proof almost absolute as to the truth of the things related." Such proof we have for every part of the Bible.

THE FOURTEENTH OF GENESIS.

The fourteenth chapter of Genesis relates that "In the days of Amraphel, king of Shinar, Arioch, king of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, and Tidal, king of Goiim (nations), they made war with Bera, king of Sodom, and with Bersha, king of Gomorrah, and Shinab, king of Admah, and Shemeber, king of Zeboim, and the king of Bela (the same is Zoar)." The Babylonian kings were successful and the region about the Dead Sea was subject to them for twelve years, when

a rebellion was instigated and in the following year Chedorlaomer and the kings that were with him appeared on the scene and, after capturing numerous surrounding cities, joined battle with the rebellious allies in the vale of Siddim, which was full of slime pits. The victory of Chedorlaomer was complete, and after capturing Lot and his goods in Sodom he started homeward by way of Damascus, near which place Abraham overtook him, and by a successful stratagem scattered his forces by night and recovered Lot and his goods. This story, told with so many details that its refutation would be easy if it were not true to the facts and if there were contemporary records with which to compare it, has been a special butt for the ridicule of the Higher Critics of the Wellhausen school, Professor Nöldeke confidently declaring as late as 1869 that criticism had forever disproved its claim to be historical. But here again the inscriptions on the monuments of Babylonia have come to the rescue of the sacred historian, if, indeed, he were in need of rescue. (For where general ignorance was so profound as it was respecting that period forty years ago, true modesty should have suggested caution in the expression of positive opinions in contradiction to such a detailed historical statement as this is.)

From the inscriptions already discovered and deciphered in the Valley of the Euphrates, it is now shown beyond reasonable doubt that the four kings mentioned in the Bible as joining in this expedition are not, as was freely said, "etymological inventions," but real historical persons. Amraphel is identified as the Hammurabi whose marvelous code of laws was so recently discovered by De Morgan at Susa. The "H" in the latter word simply expresses the rough breathing so well known in Hebrew. The "p" in the biblical name has taken the place of "b" by a well-recognized law of phonetic change. "Amrap" is equivalent to "Hamrab." The addition of "il" in the biblical name is probably the suffix of the divine name, like "el" in Israel.

Hammurabi is now known to have had his capital at Babylon at the time of Abraham. Until recently this chronolgy was disputed, so that the editors and contributors of the New Schaff-Herzog Cyclopedia dogmatically asserted that as Abraham lived nearly 300 years later than Hammurabi, the biblical story must be unhistorical. Hardly had these statements been printed, however, when Dr. King of the British Museum discovered indisputable evidence that two of the dynasties which formerly had been reckoned as consecutive were, in fact, contemporaneous, thus making it easy to bring Hammurabi's time down exactly to that of Abraham.

Chedorlaomer is pretty certainly identified as Kudur-Lagamar (servant of Lagamar, one of the principal Elamite gods). Kudur-Lagamar was king of Elam, and was either the father or the brother of Kudur-Mabug, whose son, Eri-Aku (Arioch), reigned over Larsa and Ur, and other cities of southern Babylonia. He speaks of Kudur-Mabug "as the father of the land of the Amorites," *i. e.,* of Palestine and Syria.

Tidal, "king of nations," was supposed by Dr. Pinches to be referred to on a late tablet in connection with Chedorlaomer and Arioch under the name Tudghula, who are said, together, to have "attacked and spoiled Babylon."

However much doubt there may be about the identification of some of these names, the main points are established, revealing a condition of things just such as is implied by the biblical narrative. Arioch styles himself king of Shumer and Accad, which embraced Babylon, where Amraphel (Hammurabi) was in his early years subject to him. This furnishes a reason for the association of Chedorlaomer and Amraphel in a campaign against the rebellious subjects in Palestine. Again, Kudur-Mabug, the father of Arioch, styles himself "Prince of the land of Amurru," *i. e.,* of Palestine and Syria. Moreover, for a long period before, kings from Babylonia had claimed possession of the whole eastern shore of the Mediterranean, including the Sinaitic Peninsula.

In light of these well-attested facts, one reads with astonishment the following words of Wellhausen, written no longer ago than 1889: "That four kings from the Persian Gulf should, 'in the time of Abraham,' have made an incursion into the Sinaitic Peninsula, that they should on this occasion have attacked five kinglets on the Dead Sea Littoral and have carried them off prisoners, and finally that Abraham should have set out in pursuit of the retreating victors, accompanied by 318 men servants, and have forced them to disgorge their prey,—all these incidents are sheer impossibilities which gain nothing in credibility from the fact that they are placed in a world which had passed away."

And we can have little respect for the logic of a later scholar (George Adam Smith), who can write the following: "We must admit that while archæology has richly illustrated the possibility of the main outlines of the Book of Genesis from Abraham to Joseph, it has not one whit of proof to offer for the personal existence or the characters of the patriarchs themselves. This is the whole change archæology has wrought; it has given us a background and an atmosphere for the stories of Genesis; it is unable to recall or certify their heroes."

But the name Abraham does appear in tablets of the age of Hammurabi. (See Professor George Barton in Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 28, 1909, page 153.) It is true that this evidently is not the Abraham of the Bible, but that of a small farmer who had rented land of a well-to-do land owner. The preservation of his name is due to the fact that the most of the tablets preserved contain contracts relating to the business of the times. There is little reason to expect that we should find a definite reference to the Abraham who in early life migrated from his native land. But it is of a good deal of significance that his name appears to have been a common one in the time and place of his nativity.

In considering the arguments in the case, it is important to

keep in mind that where so few facts are known, and general ignorance is so great, negative evidence is of small account, while every scrap of positive evidence has great weight. The burden of proof in such cases falls upon those who dispute the positive evidence. For example, in the article above referred to, Professor Barton argues that it is not "quite certain" that Arioch (Eri-Agu) was a real Babylonian king. But he admits that our ignorance is such that we must admit its "possibility." Dr. Barton further argues that "we have as yet no evidence from the inscriptions that Arad-Sin, even if he were called Iri-Agu, ever had anything to do with Hammurabi." But, he adds, "Of course, it is possible that he may have had, as their reigns must have overlapped, but that remains to be proved."

All such reasoning (and there is any amount of it in the critics of the prevalent school) reveals a lamentable lack in their logical training. When we have a reputable document containing positive historical statements which are shown by circumstantial evidence to be possible, that is all we need to accept them as true. When, further, we find a great amount of circumstantial evidence positively showing that the statements conform to the conditions of time and place, so far as we know them, this adds immensely to the weight of the testimony. We never can fill in all the background of any historical fact. But if the statement of it fits into the background so far as we can fill it in, we should accept the fact until positive contrary evidence is produced. No supposition can be more extravagant than that which Professor Barton seems to accept (which is that of the German critic, Meyer) that a Jew, more than 1,000 years after the event, obtained in Babylon the amount of exact information concerning the conditions in Babylonia in Abraham's time, found in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, and interpolated the story of Chedorlaomer's expedition into the background thus furnished. To entertain such

a supposition discredits the prevalent critical scholarship, rather than the Sacred Scriptures.

But present space forbids further enumeration of particulars. It is sufficient to say that while many more positive confirmations of the seemingly improbable statements of the sacred historians can be adduced, there have been no discoveries which necessarily contravene their statements. The cases already here enumerated relate to such widely separated times and places, and furnish explanations so unexpected, yet natural, to difficulties that have been thought insuperable, that their testimony cannot be ignored or rejected. That this history should be confirmed in so many cases and in such a remarkable manner by monuments uncovered 3,000 years after their erection, can be nothing else than providential. Surely, God has seen to it that the failing faith of these later days should not be left to grope in darkness. When the faith of many was waning and many heralds of truth were tempted to speak with uncertain sound, the very stones have cried out with a voice that only the deaf could fail to hear. Both in the writing and in the preservation of the Bible we behold the handiwork of God.

CHAPTER XVII

THE RECENT TESTIMONY OF ARCHAEOLOGY TO THE SCRIPTURES.

BY M. G. KYLE, D. D., LL. D.,
EGYPTOLOGIST.

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY, XENIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

CONSULTING EDITOR OF THE RECORDS OF THE PAST, WASHINGTON, D. C.

(The numbers in parentheses throughout this article refer to the notes at the end of the article.)

INTRODUCTION.

"Recent" is a dangerously capacious word to intrust to an archaeologist. Anything this side of the Day of Pentecost is "recent" in biblical archaeology. For this review, however, anything since 1904 is accepted to be, in a general way, the meaning of the word "recent."

"Recent testimony of archaeology" may be either the testimony of recent discoveries or recent testimony of former discoveries. A new interpretation, if it be established to be a true interpretation, is a discovery. For to uncover is not always to discover; indeed, the real value of a discovery is not its emergence, but its significance, and the discovery of its real significance is the real discovery.

The most important testimony to the Scriptures of this five-year archaeological period admits of some classification:

I. THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE PATRIARCHAL RECEPTION IN EGYPT.

The reception in Egypt accorded to Abraham and to Jacob and his sons[1] and the elevation of Joseph there[2] per-

emptorily demand either the acknowledgment of a mythical element in the stories, or the belief in a suitable historical setting therefor. Obscure, insignificant, private citizens are not accorded such recognition at a foreign and unfriendly court. While some have been conceding a mythical element in the stories[3], archaeology has uncovered to view such appropriate historical setting that the patriarchs are seen not to have been obscure, insignificant, private citizens, nor Zoan a foreign and unfriendly court.

The presence of the Semitic tongue in Hyksos' territory has long been known[4]; from still earlier than patriarchal times until much later, the Phoenicians, first cousins of the Hebrews, did the foreign business of the Egyptians[5], as the English, the Germans, and the French do the foreign business of the Chinese of today; and some familiarity, even sympathy, with Semitic religion has been strongly suspected from the interview of the Hyksos kings with the patriarchs[6]; but the discovery in 1906[7], by Petrie, of the great fortified camp at Tel-el-Yehudiyeh set at rest, in the main, the biblical question of the relation between the patriarchs and the Hyksos. The abundance of Hyksos scarabs and the almost total absence of all others mark the camp as certainly a Hyksos camp[8]; the original character of the fortifications, before the Hyksos learned the builders' craft from the Egyptians, shows them to have depended upon the bow for defense[9]; and, finally, the name Hyksos, in the Egyptian Haq Shashu[10] "Bedouin princes," brings out, sharp and clear, the harmonious picture of which we have had glimpses for a long time, of the Hyksos as wandering tribes of the desert, of "Upper and Lower Ruthen"[11]; *i. e.*, Syria and Palestine, northern and western Arabia, "Bow people"[12], as the Egyptians called them, their traditional enemies as far back as pyramid times[13].

Why, then, should not the patriarchs have had a royal reception in Egypt? They were themselves also the heads of

wandering tribes of "Upper and Lower Ruthen," in the tongue of the Egyptians, Haq Shashu, "Bedouin princes"; and among princes, a prince is a prince, however small his principality. So Abraham, the Bedouin prince, was accorded princely consideration at the Bedouin court in Egypt; Joseph, the Bedouin slave, became again the Bedouin prince when the wisdom of God with him and his rank by birth became known. And Jacob and his other sons were welcome, with all their followers and their wealth, as a valuable acquisition to the court party, always harassed by the restive and rebellious native Egyptians. This does not prove racial identity between the Hyksos and the patriarchs, but very close tribal relationship. And thus every suspicion of a mythical element in the narrative of the reception accorded the patriarchs in Egypt disappears when archaeology has testified to the true historical setting.

II. THE HITTITE VINDICATION.

A second recent testimony of archaeology gives us the great Hittite vindication. The Hittites have been, in one respect, the Trojans of Bible history; indeed, the inhabitants of old Troy were scarcely more in need of a Schliemann to vindicate their claim to reality than the Hittites of a Winckler.

In 1904 one of the foremost archaeologists of Europe said to me: "I do not believe there ever were such people as the Hittites, and I do not believe 'Kheta' in the Egyptian inscriptions was meant for the name Hittites." We will allow that archaeologist to be nameless now. But the ruins of Troy vindicated the right of her people to a place in real history, and the ruins of Boghatz-Köi bid fair to afford a more striking vindication of the Bible representation of the Hittites.

Only the preliminary announcement of Winckler's great treasury of documents from Boghatz-Köi has yet been made[14]. The complete unfolding of a long-eclipsed great national history is still awaited impatiently. But enough has

been published to redeem this people completely from their half-mythical plight, and give them a firm place in sober history greater than imagination had ever fancied for them under the stimulus of any hint contained in the Bible.

There has been brought to light a Hittite empire[15] in Asia Minor, with central power and vassal dependencies round about and with treaty rights on equal terms with the greatest nations of antiquity, thus making the Hittite power a third great power with Babylonia and Egypt, as was, indeed, foreshadowed in the great treaty of the Hittites with Rameses II., inscribed on the projecting wing of the south wall of the Temple of Amon at Karnak[16], though Rameses tried so hard to obscure the fact. The ruins at the village of Boghatz-Köi are shown also to mark the location of the Hittite capital[17], and the unknown language on the cuneiform tablets recovered there to be the Hittite tongue[18], while the cuneiform method of writing, as already upon the Amarna tablets[19], so still more clearly here, is seen to have been the diplomatic script, and in good measure the Babylonian to have been the diplomatic language of the Orient in that age[20]. And the large admixture of Babylonian words and forms in these Hittite inscriptions opens the way for the real decipherment of the Hittite language[21], and imagination can scarcely promise too much to our hopes for the light which such a decipherment will throw upon the historical and cultural background of the Bible.

Only one important point remains to be cleared up, the relation between the Hittite language of these cuneiform tablets and the language of the Hittite hieroglyphic inscription[22]. That these were identical is probable; that the hieroglyphic inscriptions represent an older form of the language, a kind of "Hieratic," is possible; that it was essentially different from the language of these tablets is improbable. There has been the Hittite vindication; the complete illumination of Hittite history is not likely to be long delayed.

III. THE PALESTINIAN CIVILIZATION.

Other recent testimony of archaeology brings before us the Palestinian civilization of the conquest period. Palestinian explorations within the last few years have yielded a startling array of "finds" illustrating things mentioned in the Bible, finds of the same things, finds of like things, and finds in harmony with things[23]. Individual mention of them all is here neither possible nor desirable. Of incomparably greater importance than these individually interesting relics of Canaanite antiquity is the answer afforded by recent research to two questions:

1. First in order, Does the Canaanite culture as revealed by the excavations accord with the story of Israel at the conquest as related in the Bible? How much of a break in culture is required by the Bible account, and how much is revealed by the excavations? For answer, we must find a standpoint somewhere between that of the dilettante traveler in the land of the microscopic scientist thousands of miles away. The careful excavator in the field occupies that sane and safe middle point of view. Petrie[24], Bliss[25], Macalister[26], Schumacker[27] and Sellin[28]—these are the men with whom to stand. And for light on the early civilization of Palestine, the great work of Macalister at Gezer stands easily first.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF POTTERY.

In determining this question of culture, too much importance has been allowed to that estimate of time and chronological order which is gained exclusively from the study of pottery. The pottery remains are not to be undervalued, and neither are they to be overvalued. Time is only one thing that shows itself in similarity or dissimilarity in pottery. Different stages of civilization at different places at the same time, and adaptation to an end either at the same time or at widely different times, show themselves in pottery, and render very uncertain any chronological deduction. And, still more,

available material may result in the production of similar pottery in two very different civilizations arising one thousand years or more apart. This civilization of pots, as a deciding criterion, is not quite adequate, and is safe as a criterion at all only when carefully compared with the testimony of location, intertribal relations, governmental domination, and literary attainments.

These are the things, in addition to the pots, which help to determine—indeed, which do determine—how much of a break in culture is required by the Bible account of the Conquest, and how much is shown by excavations. Since the Israelites occupied the cities and towns and vineyards and olive orchards of the Canaanites, and their "houses full of all good things"[29], had the same materials and in the main the same purposes for pottery and would adopt methods of cooking suited to the country, spoke the "language of Canaan"[30], and were of the same race as many of the people of Canaan, intermarried, though against their law[31], with the people of the land, and were continually chided for lapses into the idolatry and superstitious practices of the Canaanites[32], and, in short, were greatly different from them only in religion, it is evident that the only marked, immediate change to be expected at the Conquest is a change in religion, and that any other break in culture occasioned by the devastation of war will be only a break in continuance of the same kind of culture, evidence of demolition, spoliation, and reconstruction. Exactly such change in religion and interruption in culture at the Conquest period excavations show.

RELIGION AND CULTURE.

(a) The rubbish at Gezer shows history in distinct layers, and the layers themselves are in distinct groups[33]. At the bottom are layers Canaanite, not Semitic; above these, layers Semitic, Amorite giving place to Jewish; and higher still, layers of Jewish culture of the monarchy and later times.

(b) The closing up of the great tunnel to the spring within the fortifications at Gezer is placed by the layers of history in the rubbish heaps at the period of the Conquest[34]. But when a great fortification is so ruined and the power it represents so destroyed that it loses sight of its water-supply, surely the culture of the time has had an interruption, though it be not much changed. Then this tunnel, as a great engineering feat, is remarkable testimony to the advanced state of civilization at the time of its construction; but the more remarkable the civilization it represents, the more terrible must have been the disturbance of the culture which caused it to be lost and forgotten[35].

(c) Again, there is apparent an enlargement of the populated area of the city of Gezer by encroaching upon the Temple area at the period of the Conquest[36], showing at once the crowding into the city of the Israelites without the destruction of the Canaanites, as stated in the Bible, and a corresponding decline in reverence for the sacred inclosure of the High Place. While, at a time corresponding to the early period of the Monarchy[37], there is a sudden decrease of the populated area corresponding to the destruction of the Canaanites in the city by the father of Solomon's Egyptian wife[38].

(d) Of startling significance, the hypothetical Musri Egypt in North Arabia, concerning which it has been said[39] the patriarchs descended thereto, the Israelites escaped therefrom, and a princess thereof Solomon married, has been finally and definitely discredited. For Gezer was a marriage dower of that princess whom Solomon married[40], a portion of her father's dominion, and so a part of the supposed Musri, if it ever existed, and if so, at Gezer, then, we should find some evidence of this people and their civilization. Of such there is not a trace. But, instead, we find from very early times, but especially at this time, Egyptian remains in great abundance[41].

(e) Indeed, even Egyptian refinement and luxuries were

not incongruous in the Palestine of the Conquest period. The great rock-hewn, and rock-built cisterns at Taannek[42], the remarkable engineering on the tunnel at Gezer[43], the great forty-foot city wall in an Egyptian picture of Canaanite war[44], the list of richest Canaanite booty given by Thothmes III.[45], the fine ceramic and bronze utensils and weapons recovered from nearly every Palestinian excavation[46], and the literary revelations of the Amarna tablets[47], together with the reign of law seen by a comparison of the scriptural account with the Code of Hammurabi, show[48] Canaanite civilization of that period to be fully equal to that of Egypt.

(f) Then the Bible glimpses of Canaanite practices and the products of Canaanite religion now uncovered exactly agree. The mystery of the High Place of the Bible narrative, with its sacred caves, lies bare at Gezer and Taannek. The sacrifice of infants, probably first-born, and the foundation and other sacrifices of children, either infant or partly grown, appear in all their ghastliness in various places at Gezer and "practically all over the hill" at Taannek[49].

(g) But the most remarkable testimony of archaeology of this period is to the Scripture representations of the spiritual monotheism of Israel in its conflict with the horrible idolatrous polytheism of the Canaanites, the final overthrow of the latter and the ultimate triumph of the former. The history of that conflict is as plainly written at Gezer in the gradual decline of the High Place and giving way of the revolting sacrifice of children to the bowl and lamp deposit as it is in the inspired account of Joshua, Judges and Samuel. And the line that marks off the territory of divine revelation in religion from the impinging heathenism round about is as distinct as that line off the coast of Newfoundland where the cold waters of the North beat against the warm life-giving flow of the Gulf Stream. The revelation of the spade in Palestine is making to stand out every day more clearly the revelation that God made. There is no evidence of a purer religion growing up out of

that vile culture, but rather of a purer religion coming down and overwhelming it.

2. Another and still more important question concerning Palestine civilization is, What was the source and course of the dominant civilization and especially the religious culture reflected in the Bible account of the millennium preceding and the millennium succeeding the birth of Abraham? Was it from without toward Canaan or from Canaan outward? Did Palestine in her civilization and culture of those days, in much or in all, but reflect Babylonia, or was she a luminary?

PALESTINE AND BABYLONIA.

The revision of views concerning Palestinian civilization forced by recent excavations at once puts a bold interrogation point to the opinion long accepted by many of the source and course of religious influence during this formative period of patriarchal history, and the time of the working out of the principles of Israel's religion into the practices of Israel's life. If the Palestinian civilization during this period was equal to that of Egypt, and so certainly not inferior to that of Babylonia, then the opinion that the flow of religious influence was then from Babylonia to Palestine must stand for its defense. Here arises the newest problem of biblical archaeology.

And one of the most expert cuneiform scholars of the day, Albert T. Clay[50], has essayed this problem and announces a revolutionary solution of it by a new interpretation of well-known material as well as the interpretation of newly acquired material. The solution is nothing less, indeed, than that instead of the source of religious influence being Babylonia, and its early course from Babylonia into Palestine, exactly the reverse is true. "That the Semitic Babylonian religion is an importation from Syria and Palestine (Amurru), that the creation, deluge, ante-diluvian patriarchs, etc., of the Babylonian came from Amurru, instead of the Hebraic stories having come from Babylonia, as held by nearly all Semitic scholars."

This is startling and far reaching in its consequences. Clay's work must be put to the test; and so it will be, before it can be finally accepted. It has, however, this initial advantage, that it is in accord with the apparent self-consciousness of the Scripture writers and, as we have seen, exactly in the direction in which recent discoveries in Palestinian civilization point.

IV. PALESTINE AND EGYPT.

Again archaeology has of late furnished illumination of certain special questions of both Old and New Testament criticism.

1. "Light from Babylonia" by L. W. King[51] of the British Museum on the chronology of the first three dynasties helps to determine the date of Hammurabi, and so of Abraham's call and of the Exodus, and, indeed, has introduced a corrective element into the chronology of all subsequent history down to the time of David and exerts a far-reaching influence upon many critical questions in which the chronological element is vital.

SACRIFICE IN EGYPT.

2. The entire absence from the offerings of old Egyptian religion of any of the great Pentateuchal ideas of sacrifice, substitution, atonement, dedication, fellowship, and, indeed, of almost every essential idea of real sacrifice, as clearly established by recent very exhaustive examination of the offering scenes[52], makes for the element of revelation in the Mosaic system by delimiting the field of rationalistic speculation on the Egyptian side. Egypt gave nothing to that system, for she had nothing to give.

THE FUTURE LIFE IN THE PENTATEUCH.

3. Then the grossly materialistic character of the Egyptian conception of the other world and of the future life, and the fact, every day becoming clearer, that the so-called and

so-much-talked-about resurrection in the belief of the Egyptians was not a resurrection at all, but a resuscitation to the same old life on "oxen, geese, bread, wine, beer, and all good things," is furnishing a most complete solution of the problem of the obscurity of the idea of the resurrection in the Pentateuchal documents. For, whether they came from Moses when he had just come from Egypt or are by some later author attributed to Moses, when he had just come from Egypt, the problem is the same: Why is the idea of the resurrection so obscure in the Pentateuch? Now to have put forth in revelation the idea of the resurrection at that time, before the growth of spiritual ideas of God and of worship here, of the other world and the future life there, and before the people under the influence of these new ideas had outgrown their Egyptian training, would have carried over into Israel's religious thinking all the low, degrading materialism of Egyptian belief on this subject. The Mosaic system made no use of Egyptian belief concerning the future life because it was not by it usable, and it kept away from open presentation of the subject altogether, because that was the only way to get the people away from Egypt's conception of the subject.

WELLHAUSEN'S MISTAKE.

4. The discovery of the Aramaic papyri at Syene[83] made possible a new chapter in Old Testament criticism, raised to a high pitch hopes for contemporary testimony on Old Testament history which hitherto hardly dared raise their heads, and contributed positive evidence on a number of important points. Tolerable, though not perfect, identifications are made out for Bagoas, Governor of the Jews; of Josephus and Diodorus; Sanballat, of Nehemiah and Josephus; and Jochanan, of Nehemiah and Josephus. But more important than all these identifications is the information that the Jews had, at that period, built a temple and offered sacrifice far from Jerusalem. Wellhausen[84] lays down the first stone

of the foundation of his Pentateuchal criticism in these words: "The returning exiles were thoroughly imbued with the ideas of Josiah's reformation and had no thought of worshiping except in Jerusalem. It cost them no sacrifice of their feelings to leave the ruined High Places unbuilt. From this date, all Jews understood, as a matter of course, that the one God had only one sanctuary." So much Wellhausen. But here is this petition of the Jews at Syene in the year 407 B. C. after Nehemiah's return declaring that they had built a temple there and established a system of worship and of sacrifices, and evidencing also that they expected the approval of the Jews at Jerusalem in rebuilding that temple and re-establishing that sacrificial worship, and, what is more, received from the governor of the Jews permission so to do, a thing which, had it been opposed by the Jews at Jerusalem was utterly inconsistent with the Jewish policy of the Persian Empire in the days of Nehemiah.

NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

5. Then the redating of the Hermetic writings[55] whereby they are thrown back from the Christian era to 500-300 B. C. opens up a completely new source of critical material for tracing the rise and progress of theological terms in the Alexandrian Greek of the New Testament. In a recent letter from Petrie, who has written a little book on the subject, he sums up the whole case, as he sees it, in these words: "My position simply is that the current religious phrases and ideas of the B. C. age must be grasped in order to understand the usages of religious language in which the New Testament is written. And we can never know the real motive of New Testament writings until we know how much is new thought and how much is current theology in terms of which the *Eu-angelos* is expressed." Whether or not all the new dates for the writings shall be permitted to stand, and Petrie's point of view be justified, a discussion of the dates and a criti-

cal examination of the Hermetic writings from the standpoint of their corrected dates alone can determine; but it is certain that the products of the examination cannot but be far-reaching in their influence and in the illumination of the teachings of Christ and the Apostles.

V. IDENTIFICATIONS.

Last and more generally, of recent testimony from archaeology to Scripture we must consider the identification of places, peoples, and events of the Bible narrative.

For many years archaeologists looked up helplessly at the pinholes in the pediment of the Parthenon, vainly speculating about what might have been the important announcement in bronze once fastened at those pinholes. At last an ingenious young American student carefully copied the pinholes, and from a study of the collocation divined at last the whole imperial Roman decree once fastened there. So, isolated identification of peoples, places, and events in the Bible may not mean so much; however startling their character, they may be, after all, only pinholes in the mosaic of Bible history, but the collocation of these identifications, when many of them have been found, indicates at last the whole pattern of the mosaic.

Now the progress of important identifications has of late been very rapid. It will suffice only to mention those which we have already studied for their intrinsic importance together with the long list of others within recent years. In 1874, Clermont-Ganneau discovered one of the boundary stones of Gezer[56], at which place now for six years Mr. R. A. Stewart Macalister has been uncovering the treasures of history of that Levitical city[57]; in 1906, Winckler discovered the Hittites at their capital city; in 1904-5, Schumacker explored Megiddo; in 1900-02, Sellin, Taannek; Jericho has now been accurately located by Sellin and the foundations of her walls laid bare; the Edomites, long denied existence in patriarchal times, have been given historical place in the time of Meremp-

tah by the papyrus Anastasia[58]; Moab, for some time past in dispute, I identified beyond further controversy at Luxor in 1908, in an inscription of Rameses II., before the time of the Exodus[59]; while Hilprecht at Nippur[60], Glaser in Arabia[61], Petrie at Maghereh and along the route of the Exodus[62], and Reisner at Samaria have been adding a multitude of geographical, ethnographical and historical identifications.

The completion of the whole list of identifications is rapidly approaching, and the collocation of these identifications has given us anew, from entirely independent testimony of archaeology, the whole outline of the biblical narrative and its surroundings, at once the necessary material for the historical imagination and the surest foundation of apologetics. Fancy for a moment that the peoples, places and events of the wanderings of Ulysses should be identified: all the strange route of travel followed; the remarkable lands visited and described, the curious creatures, half human and half monstrous, and even unmistakable traces of strange events, found, all just as the poet imagined, what a transformation in our views of Homer's great epic must take place! Henceforth that romance would be history. Let us reverse the process and fancy that the peoples, places, and events of the Bible story were as little known from independent sources as the wanderings of Ulysses; the intellectual temper of this age would unhesitatingly put the Bible story in the same mythical category in which have always been the romances of Homer. If it were possible to blot out biblical geography, biblical ethnology, and biblical history from the realm of exact knowledge, so would we put out the eyes of faith, henceforth our religion would be blind, stone blind.

Thus the value of the rapid progress of identifications appears. It is the identifications which differentiate history from myth, geography from the "land of nowhere," the record of events from tales of "never was," Scripture from folklore, and the Gospel of the Saviour of the world from the de-

lusions of hope. Every identification limits by so much the field of historical criticism. When the progress of identification shall reach completion, the work of historical criticism will be finished.

CONCLUSION.

The present status of the testimony from archaeology to Scripture, as these latest discoveries make it to be, may be pointed out in a few words.

NOT EVOLUTION.

1. The history of civilization as everywhere illuminated is found to be only partially that of the evolutionary theory of early Israelite history, but very exactly that of the biblical narrative; that is to say, this history, like all history sacred or profane, shows at times, for even a century or two, steady progress, but the regular, orderly progress from the most primitive state of society toward the highest degree of civilization, which the evolutionary theory imperatively demands, if it fulfill its intended mission, fails utterly. The best ancient work at Taannek is the earliest. From the cave dwellers to the city builders at Gezer is no long, gentle evolution; the early Amorite civilization leaps with rapid strides to the great engineering feats on the defenses and the water-works. Wherever it has been possible to institute comparison between Palestine and Egypt, the Canaanite civilization in handicraft, art, engineering, architecture, and education has been found to suffer only by that which climate, materials and location impose; in genius and in practical execution it is equal to that of Egypt, and only eclipsed, before Graeco-Roman times, by the brief glory of the Solomonic period.

HARMONY WITH SCRIPTURE.

2. When we come to look more narrowly at the details of archaeological testimony, the historical setting thus afforded for the events of the Bible narrative is seen to be exactly in

harmony with the narrative. This is very significant of the final outcome of research in early Bible history. Because views of Scripture must finally square with the results of archaeology; that is to say, with contemporaneous history, and the archaeological testimony of these past five years well indicates the present trend toward the final conclusion. The Bible narrative plainly interpreted at its face value is everywhere being sustained, while, of the great critical theories proposing to take Scripture recording events of that age at other than the face value, as the illiteracy of early Western Semitic people, the rude nomadic barbarity of Palestine and the Desert in the patriarchal age, the patriarchs not individuals but personifications, the Desert "Egypt," the gradual invasion of Palestine, the naturalistic origin of Israel's religion, the inconsequence of Moses as a law-giver, the late authorship of the Pentateuch, and a dozen others, not a single one is being definitely supported by the results of archaeological research. Indeed, reconstructing criticism hardly finds it worth while, for the most part, to look to archaeology for support.

The recent testimony of archaeology to Scripture, like all such testimony that has gone before, is definitely and uniformly favorable to the Scriptures at their face value, and not to the Scriptures as reconstructed by criticism.

AUTHORITIES REFERRED TO ABOVE.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN REFERENCES.

O. L. Z.=Orientalistischen Litteratur-Zeitung.

Q. S.=Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Society.

REFERENCES.

(1) Gen. 12:10-20; 13:1; 47:1-12.

(2) Gen. 41:14-46.

(3) Orr, "The Problem of the Old Testament," pp. 57-58, quoting Schultz, Wellhausen, Kuenen, W. R. Smith, G. B. Gray, H. P. Smith, F. H. Woods.

(4) Brugsch, "Egypt under the Pharaohs," Broderick edition, Chap. VI.
(5) Ibid.
(6) Gen. 41:25-39.
(7) Petrie, "Hyksos and Israelite Cities."
(8) Ibid, pp. 3 and 10, Plate IX.
(9) Ibid, pp. 5-9. Plates II, III, IV.
(10) Budge, "History of Egypt," Vol. III, pp. 137-138.
(11) Kyle, Recueil de Travaux, Vol. XXX, "Geographic and Ethnic Lists of Rameses II."
(12) Müller, "Asien und Europa." 2tes Kapitel.
(13) Ibid.
(14) Winckler, O. L. Z., December 15, 1906.
(15) Ibid.
(16) Bouriant, Recueil de Travaux, Vol. XIII, pp. 15 ff.; Budge, "History of Egypt," Vol. V, pp. 48 ff.; Goodwin, "Records of the Past," 1st Series, Vol. IV, pp. 25 ff.
(17) Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesselschaft: 1902, p. 5. Müller, Recueil de Travaux, Vol. VIII, 126 ff. Budge, "History of Egypt," V, 30 ff.
(18) Winckler, O. L. Z., December 15, 1906. (Sonderabzug, p. 15.)
(19) Ibid. (Sonderabzug, p. 22.)
(20) Conder. "Tel Amarna Tablets." Budge, "History of Egypt," Vol. IV, pp. 184-241.
(21) Winckler, O. L. Z., December 15, 1906. Sonderabzug.
(22) Messersmidt, Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesselchaft; Corpus, Unscrip. Het.—1902.
(23) Vincent, "Canaan."
(24) Petrie, "Lachish."
(25) Bliss, "A Mound of Many Cities."
(26) Macalister, "Bible Side Lights from the Mound of Gezer."
(27) Schumacker, "Excavations at Megiddo."

(28) Sellin, Tel-Taannek, "Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie in Wien."
(29) Deut. 6:10-11; Josh. 24:13; Neh. 9:25.
(30) Isa. 19:18.
(31) Ezek. 16:44-46; Deut. 7:3.
(32) Judges 2:11-15; 3:7; 8:33-35; 18:30-31.
(33) Macalister, Q. S., 1903, pp. 8-9, 49.
(34) Macalister, Q. S., 1908, p. 17.
(35) Vincent, in Q. S., 1908, p. 228.
(36) Macalister, Q. S., 1903, p. 49.
(37) Ibid.
(38) I. Kings 9:16.
(39) Winckler, Orientalistische Forschungen, Series I, pp. 24-41.
(40) I. Kings 9:16.
(41) Macalister, Q. S., 1903, p. 309.
(42) Sellin, "Tel-Taannek," p. 92.
(43) Macalister, Q. S., 1908, Jan.-Apr.
(44) Petrie, "Deshasha," Plate IV.
(45) Birch, "Records of the Past," 1st Series, Vol. II, pp. 35-52, "Battle of Megiddo." Also Lepsius, "Denkmäler." Abth. III. Bl. 32, 31st, 30th, 30B, "Auswahl," XII, L. 42-45.
(46) Macalister-Vincent, Q. S., 1898-08.
(47) Budge, "History of Egypt," Vol. IV, pp. 184-241.
(48) Gen. 21-38. King, "Code of Hammurabi."
(49) Macalister, Q. S., 1903, ff., and "Bible Side Lights," Chap. III. Also Sellin, "Tel-Taannek," pp. 96-97.
(50) Clay, "Amurru, The Home of the Northern Semites."
(51) King, "Chronology of the First Three Babylonian Dynasties."
(52) Kyle, Recueil de Travaux. "Egyptian Sacrifices." Vol. XXVII, "Further Observations," Vol. XXXI. Bibliotheca Sacra, Apr., 1905, pp. 323-336.
(53) Margoliouth, "Expository Times," December, 1907. Jo-

sephus, "Antiquities," 11:7; Deadorus Siculus. Sec. 3; 17-35. Neh. 13:28; 12:22; 2 Esdras 5:14.
(54) Wellhausen, Ency. Brit., Vol. 18, p. 509.
(55) Petrie, "Personal Religion in Egypt Before Christianity."
(56) Clermont-Ganneau in "Bible Side Lights," p. 22.
(57) Macalister, "Bible Side Lights." Also Q. S., 1902-09.
(58) Müller, "Asien und Europa."
(59) Kyle, Recueil de Travaux, Vol. XXX. "Ethnic and Geographical Lists of Rameses II."
(60) Hilprecht, "Explorations in Babylonia."
(61) Weber, Forschungsreisen—Edouard Glaser; also "Studien zur Südarabischen Altertumskunde," Weber.
(62) Petrie, "Researches in Sinai."

CHAPTER XVIII

SCIENCE AND CHRISTIAN FAITH

BY REV. PROF. JAMES ORR, D. D.,

UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW, SCOTLAND

In many quarters the belief is industriously circulated that the advance of "science," meaning by this chiefly the physical sciences — astronomy, geology, biology, and the like — has proved damaging, if not destructive, to the claims of the Bible, and the truth of Christianity. Science and Christianity are pitted against each other. Their interests are held to be antagonistic. Books are written, like Draper's "Conflict Between Religion and Science," White's "Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom," and Foster's "Finality of the Christian Religion," to show that this warfare between science and religion has ever been going on, and can never in the nature of things cease till theology is destroyed, and science holds sole sway in men's minds.

This was not the attitude of the older investigators of science. Most of these were devout Christian men. Naville, in his book, "Modern Physics," has shown that the great discoverers in science in past times were nearly always devout men. This was true of Galileo, Kepler, Bacon, and Newton; it was true of men like Faraday, Brewster, Kelvin, and a host of others in more recent times. The late Professor Tait, of Edinburgh, writing in "The International Review," said: "The assumed incompatibility of religion and science has been so often and confidently asserted in recent times that it has come * * * to be taken for granted by the writers of leading articles, etc., and it is, of course, perpetually thrust before their too trusting readers. But the whole thing is a mistake, and a mistake so grave that no truly scientific

man * * * runs, in Britain, at least, the smallest risk of making it. * * * With a few, and these very singular exceptions, the truly scientific men and true theologians of the present day have not found themselves under the necessity of quarrelling." The late Professor G. J. Romanes has, in his "Thoughts on Religion," left the testimony that one thing which largely influenced him in his return to faith was the fact that in his own university of Cambridge nearly all the men of most eminent scientific attainments were avowed Christians. "The curious thing," he says, "is that all the most illustrious names were ranged on the side of orthodoxy. Sir W. Manson, Sir George Stokes, Professors Tait, Adams, Clerk Maxwell, and Bayley—not to mention a number of lesser lights, such as Routte, Todhunter, Ferrers, etc.,—were all avowed Christians" (page 137). It may be held that things are now changed. To some extent this is perhaps true, but anyone who knows the opinions of our leading scientific men is aware that to accuse the majority of being men of unchristian or unbelieving sentiment is to utter a gross libel.

If by a conflict of science and religion is meant that grievous mistakes have often been made, and unhappy misunderstandings have arisen, on one side and the other, in the course of the progress of science,—that new theories and discoveries, as in astronomy and geology, have been looked on with distrust by those who thought that the truth of the Bible was being affected by them,—that in some cases the dominant church sought to stifle the advance of truth by persecution,—this is not to be denied. It is an unhappy illustration of how the best of men can at times err in matters which they imperfectly understand, or where their prejudices and traditional ideas are affected. But it proves nothing against the value of the discoveries themselves, or the deeper insight into the ways of God of the men who made them, or of real contradiction between the new truth and the essential teaching of the Scriptures. On the contrary, as a minority generally

perceived from the first, the supposed disharmony with the truths of the Bible was an unreal one, early giving way to better understanding on both sides, and finally opening up new vistas in the contemplation of the Creator's power, wisdom, and majesty. It is never to be forgotten, also, that the error was seldom all on one side; that science, too, has in numberless cases put forth its hasty and unwarrantable theories and has often had to retract even its truer speculations within limits which brought them into more perfect harmony with revealed truth. If theology has resisted novelties of science, it has often had good reason for so doing.

It is well in any case that this alleged conflict of Christianity with science should be carefully probed, and that it should be seen where exactly the truth lies in regard to it.

I. SCIENCE AND LAW—MIRACLE

It is perhaps more in its *general outlook* on the world than in its specific results that science is alleged to be in conflict with the Bible and Christianity. The Bible is a record of revelation. Christianity is a supernatural system. Miracle, in the sense of a direct entrance of God in word and deed into human history for gracious ends, is of the essence of it. On the other hand, the advance of science has done much to deepen the impression of the universal reign of *natural law.* The effect has been to lead multitudes whose faith is not grounded in direct spiritual experience to look askance on the whole idea of the supernatural. God, it is assumed, has His own mode of working, and that is by means of secondary agencies operating in absolutely uniform ways; miracles, therefore, cannot be admitted. And, since miracles are found in Scripture,—since the entire Book rests on the idea of a supernatural economy of grace,—the whole must be dismissed as in conflict with the modern mind. Professor G. B. Foster goes so far as to declare that a man can hardly be intellectually

honest who in these days professes to believe in the miracles of the Bible.

It is overstating the case to speak of this *repugnance to miracle*, and rejection of it in the Bible, as if it were really new. It is as old as rationalism itself. You find it in Spinoza, in Reimarus, in Strauss, in numberless others. DeWette and Vatke, among earlier Old Testament critics, manifested it as strongly as their followers do now, and made it a pivot of their criticism. It governed the attacks on Christianity made in the age of the deists. David Hume wrote an essay against miracles which he thought had settled the question forever. But, seriously considered, can this attack on the idea of miracle, derived from our experience of the uniformity of nature's laws, be defended? Does it not in itself involve a huge assumption, and run counter to experience and common sense? The question is one well worth asking.

First, what *is* a miracle? Various definitions might be given, but it will be enough to speak of it here as *any effect in nature, or deviation from its ordinary course, due to the interposition of a supernatural cause.* It is no necessary part, it should be observed, of the Biblical idea of miracle, that natural agencies should not be employed as far as they will go. If the drying of the Red Sea to let the Israelites pass over was due in part to a great wind that blew, this was none the less of God's ordering, and did not detract from the supernatural character of the event as a whole. It was still at God's command that the waters were parted, and that a way was made at that particular time and place for the people to go through. These are what theologians call "providential" miracles, in which, so far as one can see, natural agencies, under divine direction, suffice to produce the result. There is, however, another and more conspicuous class, the instantaneous cleansing of the leper, e. g., or the raising of the dead, in which natural agencies are obviously altogether transcended.

It is this class about which the chief discussion goes on. They are miracles in the stricter sense of a complete transcendence of nature's laws.

What, in the next place, is meant by the *uniformity of nature?* There are, of course, laws of nature—no one disputes that. It is quite a mistake to suppose that the Bible, though not written in the twentieth century, knows nothing of a regular order and system of nature. The world is God's world; it is established by His decree; He has given to every creature its nature, its bounds, its limits; all things continue according to His ordinances (Psa. 119:91). Only, law in the Bible is never viewed as having an independent existence. It is always regarded as an expression of the power or wisdom of God. And this gives the right point of view for considering the relation of law to miracle. What, to begin with, do we mean by a "law" of nature? It is, as science will concede, only our registered observation of the order in which we find causes and events linked together in our experience. That they are so linked no one questions. If they were not, we should have no world in which we could live at all. But then, next, what do we mean by "uniformity" in this connection? We mean no more than this—that, given like causes, operating under like conditions, like effects will follow. Quite true; no one denies this either.

But then, as J. S. Mill, in his *Logic,* pointed out long ago, a miracle in the strict sense is not a denial of either of these truths. A miracle is not the assertion that, the same causes operating, a different result is produced. It is, on the contrary, the assertion that a *new* cause has intervened, and this a cause which the theists cannot deny to be a *vera causa*—the will and power of God. Just as, when I lift my arm, or throw a stone high in the air, I do not abolish the law of gravitation but counteract or overrule its purely natural action by the introduction of a new spiritual force; so, but in an infinitely higher

way, is a miracle due to the interposition of the First Cause of all, God Himself. What the scientific man needs to prove to establish his objection to miracle is, not simply that natural causes operate uniformly, but that no other than natural causes exist; that natural causes exhaust all the causation in the universe. And that, we hold, he can never do.

It is obvious from what has now been said that the real question at issue in miracle is not natural law, but *Theism*. It is to be recognized at once that miracle can only profitably be discussed on the basis of a theistic view of the universe. It is not disputed that there are views of the universe which exclude miracle. The atheist cannot admit miracle, for he has no God to work miracles. The pantheist cannot admit miracle, for to him God and nature are one. The deist cannot admit miracle, for he has separated God and the universe so far that he can never bring them together again. The question is not, Is miracle possible on an atheistic, a materialistic, a pantheistic, view of the world, but, Is it possible on a theistic view—on the view of God as at once immanent in His world, and in infinite ways transcending it? I say nothing of intellectual "honesty," but I do marvel, as I have often said, at the *assurance* of any one who presumes to say that, for the highest and holiest ends in His personal relations with His creatures, God can work only within the limits which nature imposes; that He cannot act without and above nature's order if it pleases Him to do so. Miracles stand or fall by their evidence, but the attempt to rule them out by any *a priori* dictum as to the uniformity of natural law must inevitably fail. The same applies to the denial of providence or of answers to prayer on the ground of the uniformity of natural law. Here no breach of nature's order is affirmed, but only a governance or direction of nature of which man's own use of natural laws, without breach of them, for special ends, affords daily examples.

II. SCRIPTURE AND THE SPECIAL SCIENCES

Approaching more nearly the alleged conflict of the Bible or Christianity with the special sciences, a first question of importance is, What is the *general relation* of the Bible to science? How does it claim to relate itself to the advances of natural knowledge? Here, it is to be feared, mistakes are often made on both sides—on the side of science in affirming contrariety of the Bible with scientific results where none really exists; on the side of believers in demanding that the Bible be taken as a text-book of the newest scientific discoveries, and trying by forced methods to read these into them. The truth on this point lies really on the surface. The Bible clearly does not profess to anticipate the scientific discoveries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Its design is very different; namely, to reveal God and His will and His purposes of grace to men, and, as involved in this, His general relation to the creative world, its dependence in all its parts on Him, and His orderly government of it in Providence for His wise and good ends. Natural things are taken as they are given, and spoken of in simple, popular language, as we ourselves every day speak of them. The world it describes is the world men know and live in, and it is described as it appears, not as, in its recondite researches, science reveals its inner constitution to us. Wise expositors of the Scriptures, older and younger, have always recognized this, and have not attempted to force its language further. To take only one example, John Calvin, who wrote before the Copernican system of astronomy had obtained common acceptance, in his commentary on the first chapter of Genesis penned these wise words: "He who would learn astronomy and other recondite arts," he said, "let him go elsewhere. Moses wrote in a popular style things which, without instruction, all ordinary persons indued with common sense are able to understand. * * * He does not call us up to heaven, he only

proposes things that lie open before our eyes." To this hour, with all the light of modern science around us, we speak of sun, moon and stars "rising" and "setting," and nobody misunderstands or affirms contradiction with science. There is no doubt another side to this, for it is just as true that in depicting natural things, the Bible, through the Spirit of revelation that animates it, seizes things in so just a light—still with reference to its own purposes—that the mind is prevented from being led astray from the great truths intended to be conveyed.

It will serve to illustrate these positions as to the relation of the Bible to science if we look at them briefly in their application to the two sciences of *astronomy* and *geology*, in regard to which conflict has often been alleged.

1. The change from the *Ptolemaic* to the *Copernican* system of *astronomy*—from the view which regarded the earth as the center of the universe to the modern and undoubtedly true view of the earth as moving round the sun, itself, with its planets, but one of innumerable orbs in the starry heavens—of necessity created great searchings of heart among those who thought that the language of the Bible committed them to the older system. For a time there was strong opposition on the part of many theologians, as well as of students of science, to the new discoveries of the telescope. Galileo was imprisoned by the church. But truth prevailed, and it was soon perceived that the Bible, using the language of appearances, was no more committed to the literal moving of the sun round the earth than are our modern almanacs, which employ the same forms of speech. One would have to travel far in these days to find a Christian who feels his faith in the least affected by the discovery of the true doctrine of the solar system. He rejoices that he understands nature better, and reads his Bible without the slightest sense of contradiction. Yet Strauss was confident that the Copernican system had given its death-blow to Christianity; as Voltaire

before him had affirmed that Christianity would be overthrown by the discovery of the law of gravitation and would not survive a century. Newton, the humble-minded Christian discoverer of the law of gravitation, had no such fear, and time has shown that it was he, not Voltaire, who was right. These are specimens of the "conflicts" of Christianity with science.

The so-called "astronomical objection" to Christianity more specially takes the form of enlarging on the *illimitableness* of the universe disclosed by science in contrast with the *peculiar interest* of God in man displayed in the Christian Gospel. "What is man that thou art mindful of him?" (Psa. 8:4). Is it credible that this small speck in an infinity of worlds should be singled out as the scene of so tremendous an exhibition of God's love and grace as is implied in the Incarnation of the Son of God, the Sacrifice of the Cross, the Redemption of Man? The day is well-nigh past when even this objection is felt to carry much weight. Apart from the strange fact that up to this hour no evidence seems to exist of other worlds inhabited by rational intelligences like man—no planets, no known systems (on this point A. R. Wallace's "Man and the Universe" may be consulted)—thoughtful people have come to realize that quantitative bigness is no measure of God's love and care; that the value of a soul is not to be estimated in terms of stars and planets; that sin is not less awful a fact even if it were proved that this is the only spot in the universe in which it has emerged. It is of the essence of God's infinity that He cares for the little as well as for the great; not a blade of grass could wave, or the insect of a day live its brief life upon the wing, if God were not actually present, and minutely careful of it. Man's position in the universe remains, by consent, or rather by proof, of science, an altogether peculiar one. Link between the material and the spiritual, he is the one being that seems fitted, as Scripture affirms he is, to be the bond of unity in

the creation (Heb. 2:6-9). This is the hope held out to us in Christ (Eph. 1:10). One should reflect also that, while the expanse of the *physical* universe is a modern thought, there has never been a time in the Christian Church when God—Himself infinite—was not conceived of as adored and served by *countless hosts* of ministering spirits. Man was never thought of as the only intelligence in creation. The mystery of the divine love to our world was in reality as great before as after the stellar expanses were discovered. The sense of "conflict," therefore, though not the sense of wonder, awakened by the "exceeding riches" of God's grace to man in Christ Jesus, vanishes with increasing realization of the depths and heights of God's love "which passeth knowledge" (Eph. 3:19). Astronomy's splendid demonstration of the majesty of God's wisdom and power is undiminished by any feeling of disharmony with the Gospel.

2. As it is with astronomy, so it has been with the revelations of *geology* of the age and gradual formation of the earth. Here also doubt and suspicion were—naturally enough in the circumstances—at first awakened. The gentle Cowper could write in his "Task" of those

> "* * * who drill and bore
> The solid earth and from the strata there
> Extract a register, by which we learn
> That He who made it, and revealed its date
> To Moses, was mistaken in its age."

If the intention of the first chapter of Genesis was really to give us the "date" of the creation of the earth and heavens, the objection would be unanswerable. But things, as in the case of astronomy, are now better understood, and few are disquieted in reading their Bibles because it is made certain that the world is immensely older than the 6,000 years which the older chronology gave it. Geology is felt only to have expanded our ideas of the vastness and marvel of the Creator's

operations through the æons of time during which the world, with its teeming populations of fishes, birds, reptiles, mammals, was preparing for man's abode—when the mountains were being upheaved, the valleys being scooped out, and veins of precious metals being inlaid into the crust of the earth.

Does science, then, really, contradict Genesis I.? Not surely if what has been above said of the essentially popular character of the allusions to natural things in the Bible be remembered. Here certainly is no detailed description of the process of the formation of the earth in terms anticipative of modern science—terms which would have been unintelligible to the original readers—but a sublime picture, true to the order of nature, as it is to the broad facts even of geological succession. If it tells how God called heaven and earth into being, separated light from darkness, sea from land, clothed the world with vegetation, gave sun and moon their appointed rule of day and night, made fowl to fly, and sea-monsters to plow the deep, created the cattle and beasts of the field, and finally made man, male and female, in His own image, and established him as ruler over all God's creation, this orderly rise of created forms, man crowning the whole, these deep ideas of the narrative, setting the world at the very beginning in its right relation to God, and laying the foundations of an enduring philosophy of religion, are truths which science does nothing to subvert, but in myriad ways confirms. The "six days" may remain as a difficulty to some, but, if this is not part of the symbolic setting of the picture—a great divine "week" of work—one may well ask, as was done by Augustine long before geology was thought of, what kind of "days" these were which rolled their course before the sun, with its twenty-four hours of diurnal measurement, was appointed to that end? There is no violence done to the narrative in substituting in thought "æonic" days—vast cosmic periods—for "days" on our narrower, sun-measured scale. Then the last trace of apparent "conflict" disappears.

III. EVOLUTION AND MAN

In recent years the point in which "conflict" between Scripture and science is most frequently urged is the apparent contrariety of the theory of *evolution* to the Bible story of the direct *creation* of the animals and man. This might be met, and often is, as happened in the previous cases, by denying the reality of any evolutionary process in nature. Here also, however, while it must be conceded that evolution is not yet *proved,* there seems a growing appreciation of the strength of the evidence for the fact of some form of evolutionary origin of species—that is, of some genetic connection of higher with lower forms. Together with this, at the same time, there is manifest an increasing disposition to limit the scope of evolution, and to modify the theory in very essential points—those very points in which an apparent conflict with Scripture arose.

Much of the difficulty on this subject has arisen from the unwarrantable confusion or identification of evolution with *Darwinism.* Darwinism is a theory of the process of evolution, and both on account of the skill with which it was presented, and of the singular eminence of its propounder, obtained for a time a very remarkable prestige. In these later days, as may be seen by consulting a book like R. Otto's "Naturalism and Religion," published in "The Crown Library," that prestige has greatly declined. A newer evolution has arisen which breaks with Darwin on the three points most essential to his theory: 1. The *fortuitous character of the variations* on which "natural selection" works. Variations are now felt to be along definite lines, and to be guided to definite ends. 2. The *insuffiency of "natural selection"* (on which Darwin almost wholly relied) to accomplish the tasks Darwin assigned to it. 3. *The slow and insensible rate of the changes* by which new species were supposed to be produced. Instead of this the newer tendency is to seek the origin of new species

in rapid and sudden changes, the causes of which lie within the organism—in "mutations," as they are coming to be called—so that the process may be as brief as formerly it was supposed to be long. "Evolution," in short, is coming to be recognized as but a new name for "creation," only that the creative power now works from *within,* instead of, as in the old conception, in an *external,* plastic fashion. It is, however, creation none the less.

In truth, no conception of evolution can be formed, compatible with all the facts of science, which does not take account, at least at certain great critical points, of the entrance of *new factors* into the process we call creation. 1. One such point is the transition from inorganic to organic existence—the entrance of the new power of *life.* It is hopeless to seek to account for life by purely mechanical and chemical agencies, and science has well-nigh given up the attempt. 2. A second point is in the transition from purely organic development to *consciousness.* A sensation is a mental fact different in kind from any merely organic change, and inexplicable by it. Here, accordingly, is a new rise, revealing previously unknown spiritual powers. 3. The third point is in the transition to *rationality, personality,* and *moral life* in man. This, as man's capacity for self-conscious, self-directed, progressive life evinces, is something different from the purely animal consciousness, and marks the beginning of a new kingdom. Here, again, the Bible and science are felt to be in harmony. Man is the last of God's created works—the crown and explanation of the whole—and he is made in God's image. To account for him, a special act of the Creator, constituting him what he is, must be presupposed. This creative act does not relate to the soul only, for higher spiritual powers could not be put into a merely animal brain. There must be a rise on the physical side as well, corresponding with the mental advance. In body, as in spirit, man comes from his Creator's hand.

If this new evolutionary conception is accepted, most of

the difficulties which beset the Darwinian theory fall away. 1. For one thing, man need no longer be thought of as a *slow development* from the animal stage—an ascent through brutishness and savagery from an ape-like form. His origin may be as sudden as Genesis represents. 2. The need for assuming an enormous *antiquity* of man to allow for the slow development is no longer felt. And (3), the need of assuming man's *original condition* to have been one of brutal passion and subjection to natural impulse disappears. Man may have come from his Creator's hand in as morally pure a state, and as capable of sinless development, as Genesis and Paul affirm. This also is the most worthy view to take of man's origin. It is a view borne out by the absence of all reliable evidence of those ape-like intermediate forms which, on the other hypothesis, must have intervened between the animal-progenitors and the finished human being. It is a view not contradicted by the alleged evidences of man's very great antiquity—100,000, 200,000, or 500,000 years—frequently relied on; for most of these and the extravagant measurements of time connected with them, are precarious in the extreme. The writer's book, "God's Image in Man and Its Defacement," may be consulted on these points.

The conclusion from the whole is, that, up to the present hour, science and the Biblical views of God, man, and the world, do not stand in any real relation of conflict. Each book of God's writing reflects light upon the pages of the other, but neither contradicts the other's essential testimony. Science itself seems now disposed to take a less materialistic view of the origin and nature of things than it did a decade or two ago, and to interpret the creation more in the light of the spiritual. The experience of the Christian believer, with the work of missions in heathen lands, furnishes a testimony that cannot be disregarded to the reality of this spiritual world, and of the regenerating, transforming forces proceeding from it. To God be all the glory!

CHAPTER XIX

MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE WITH THE HIGHER CRITICISM

BY PROF. J. J. REEVE, SOUTHWESTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, FORT WORTH, TEXAS, U. S. A.

The purpose of this article is to state in a very brief way the influences which led me to accept certain of the views of the Higher Criticism, and after further consideration, to reject them. Necessarily the reasons for rejecting will be given at greater length than those for accepting. Space will not permit me to mention names of persons, books, articles and various other influences which combined to produce these results. I shall confine myself to an outline of the mental processes which resulted from my contact with the Critical Movement.

In outlining this change of view, I shall deal with—

I. THE PRESUPPOSITIONS OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM

These presuppositions and assumptions are the determining elements in the entire movement. Once they are understood, it is not difficult to understand the higher critics. It is their philosophy or world-view that is responsible for all their speculations and theories. Their mental attitude towards the world and its phenomena is the same as their attitude toward the Bible and the religion therein revealed. These presuppositions appealed to me very strongly. Having spent some time at one of the great American universities, thus coming in contact with some of the leading minds of the country, the critical view was presented to me very ably and attractively. Though resisted for a time, the forcefulness of the teaching and influence of the university atmosphere largely won my assent. The critics seemed to have the logic of

things on their side. The results at which they had arrived seemed inevitable. But upon closer thinking I saw that the whole movement with its conclusions was the result of the adoption of the hypothesis of evolution. My professors had accepted this view, and were thoroughly convinced of its correctness as a working hypothesis. Thus I was made to feel the power of this hypothesis and to adopt it. This world-view is wonderfully fascinating and almost compelling. The vision of a cosmos developing from the lowest types and stages upward through beast and man to higher and better man is enchanting and almost overwhelming. That there is a grain of truth in all this most thinkers will concede. One can hardly refuse to believe that through the ages "An increasing purpose runs," that there is "One God, one law, one element, and one far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves." This world-view had to me at first a charm and witchery that was almost intoxicating. It created more of a *revolution* than an *evolution* in my thinking. But more careful consideration convinced me that the little truth in it served to sugar-coat and give plausibility to some deadly errors that lurked within. I saw that the hypothesis did not apply to a great part of the world's phenomena.

That this theory of evolution underlies and is the inspiration of the Higher Criticism goes without saying. That there is a grain of truth in it we may admit or not, as we see fit, but the whole question is, what kind of evolution is it that has given rise to this criticism. There are many varieties of the theory. There is the Idealism of Hegel, and the Materialism of Haeckel; a theistic evolution and an antitheistic; the view that it is God's only method, and the view that it is only one of God's methods; the theory that includes a Creator, and the theory that excludes Him; the deistic evolution, which starts the world with God, who then withdraws and leaves it a closed system of cause and effect, antecedent and consequent, which admits of no break or change in the natural

process. There is also the theory that on the whole there is progress, but allowance must be made for retrogression and degeneration. This admits of the direct action of God in arresting the downward process and reversing the current; that is, there is an evolution through revelation, etc., rather than a revelation by evolution. On examining the evolution of the leaders of the Critical School, I found that it was of a naturalistic or practically deistic kind. All natural and mental phenomena are in a closed system of cause and effect, and the hypothesis applies universally, to religion and revelation, as well as to mechanisms.

This type of evolution may not be accepted by all adherents of the Critical School, but it is substantially the view of the leaders, Reuss, Graf, Vatke, Kuenen and Wellhausen. To them all nature and history are a product of forces within and in process of development. There has not been and could not be any direct action of God upon man, there could be no break in the chain of cause and effect, of antecedent and consequent. Hence there can be no miracle or anything of what is known as the supernatural. There could be no "interference" in any way with the natural course of events, there could be no "injection" of any power into the cosmic process from without, God is shut up to the one method of bringing things to pass. He is thus little more than a prisoner in His own cosmos. Thus I discovered that the Critical Movement was essentially and fundamentally anti-supernatural and anti-miraculous. According to it all religious movements are human developments along natural and materialistic lines. The religion of Israel and the Bible is no exception, as there can be no exception to this principle. The revelation contained in the Bible is, strictly speaking, no *revelation;* it is a natural development with God in the cosmic process behind it, but yet a steady, straight-lined, mechanical development such as can be traced step by step as a flight of stairs may be measured by a foot-rule. There could have been no epoch-

making revelation, no revivals and lapses, no marvelous exhibitions of divine power, no real redemption. With these foregone conclusions fixed in their minds, the entire question is practically settled beforehand. As it is transparently clear that the Bible on the face of it does not correspond to this view, it must be rearranged so as to correspond to it. To do this, they must deny point-blank the claims and statements of most of the Bible writers. Now, if the Bible claims to be anything, it claims to be a revelation from God, a miraculous or supernatural book, recording the numerous direct acts of God in nature and history, and His interference with the natural course of events. Are the writers of the Bible correct, or are the critics? It is impossible that both should be right.

Reasoning thus, it became perfectly clear to me that the presuppositions and beliefs of the Bible writers and of the critics were absolutely contradictory. To maintain that the modern view is a development and advance upon the Biblical view, is absurd. No presupposition can develop a presupposition which contradicts and nullifies it. To say that the critical position and the Biblical position, or the traditional evangelical view which is the same as the Biblical, are reconcilable, is the most fatuous folly and delusion. Kuenen and others have recognized this contradiction and have acknowledged it, not hesitating to set aside the Biblical view. Many of their disciples have failed to see as clearly as their masters. They think the two can be combined. I was of the same opinion myself, but further reflection showed this to be an impossibility. I thought it possible to accept the results of the Higher Criticism without accepting its presuppositions. This is saying that one can accept as valid and true the results of a process and at the same time deny the validity of the process itself. But does not this involve an inner contradiction and absurdity? If I accept the results of the Kuenen-Wellhausen hypothesis as correct, then I accept as correct the methods and processes

which led to these results, and if I accept these methods, I also accept the presuppositions which give rise to these methods. If the "assured results" of which the critics are so fond of boasting are true, then the naturalistic evolution hypothesis which produced these results is correct. Then it is impossible to accept the miraculous or supernatural, the Bible as an authoritative record of supernatural revelation is completely upset and its claims regarding itself are false and misleading. I can see no way of escaping these conclusions. There is no possible middle ground as I once fondly imagined there was. Thus I was compelled to conclude that although there is some truth in the evolutionary view of the world, yet as an explanation of history and revelation it is utterly inadequate, so inadequate as to be erroneous and false. A world-view must be broad enough to admit of all the facts of history and experience. Even then it is only a human point of view and necessarily imperfect. Will any one dare to say that the evolutionary hypothesis is divine? Then we would have a Bible and a philosophy both claiming to be divine and absolutely contradicting each other. To attempt to eliminate the miraculous and supernatural from the Bible and accept the remainder as divine is impossible, for they are all one and inextricably woven together. In either case the Book is robbed of its claims to authority. Some critics do not hesitate to deny its authority and thus cut themselves loose from historical Christianity.

In spite, however, of the serious faults of the Higher Criticism, it has given rise to what is known as the Scientific and Historical method in the study of the Old Testament. This method is destined to stay and render invaluable aid. To the scholarly mind its appeal is irresistible. Only in the light of the historical occasion upon which it was produced, can the Old Testament be properly understood. A flood of light has already been poured in upon these writings. The scientific spirit which gave rise to it is one of the noblest instincts in

the intellectual life of man. It is a thirst for the real and the true, that will be satisfied with nothing else. But, noble as is this scientific spirit, and invaluable as is the historical method, there are subtle dangers in connection with them. Everything depends upon the presuppositions with which we use the method. A certain mental attitude there must be. What shall it be? A materialistic evolution such as Kuenen and his confreres, or a theistic evolution which admits the supernatural? Investigating in the mental attitude of the first of these, the scholar will inevitably arrive at or accept the results of the critics. Another, working at the same problem with Christian presuppositions, will arrive at very different conclusions. Which shall we have, the point of view of the Christian or the critic? I found that the critics' claim to possess the only really scientific method was slightly true but largely false. His results were scientific because they fitted his hypothesis. The Christan scholar with his broader presuppositions was peremptorily ruled out of court. Anything savoring of the miraculous, etc., could not be scientific to the critic, and hence it could not be true, therefore, it must be discarded or branded as Myth, Legend, Poesy, Saga, etc. Such narrowness of view is scarcely credible on the part of scholars who claim to be so broad and liberal.

Another question confronted me. How can so many Christian scholars and preachers accept the views of the critics and still adhere to evangelical Christianity with intense devotion? As we have seen, to accept the results of Criticism is to accept the methods and presuppositions which produced these results. To accept their assumptions is to accept a naturalistic evolution which is fundamentally contradictory to the Biblical and Christian point of view. It is therefore essentially contradictory to Christianity, for what is the latter if it is not a supernaturally revealed knowledge of the plan of salvation, with supernatural power to effectuate that salvation? All who have experienced the power of Christianity will in the main assent

to this definition. How then can Christians who are Higher Critics escape endorsing the presuppositions of the Critics? There is an inner contradiction between the assumptions of their scientific reason and the assumptions of their religious faith. A careful study of the attitude of these mediating critics, as they are called, has revealed a sense of contradiction somewhere of which they are vaguely conscious. They maintain their attitude by an inconsistency. Thus it is they have many difficulties which they cannot explain. This inner contradiction runs through much of their exegesis and they wonder that evangelical Christians do not accept their views. Already many of them are not quite so sure of their "assured results" as they were. Many evangelical Christians do not accept these views because they can "see through" them.

The second line of thinking which led me to reject the Critics' view was a consideration of

II. THEIR METHODS

At first I was enthusiastic over the method. Now at last we have the correct method that will in time solve all difficulties. Let it be readily granted that the historical method has settled many difficulties and will continue to do so, yet the whole question lies in the attitude of mind a man brings to the task. Among the critics their hypothesis is absolute and dominates every attempt to understand the record, shapes every conclusion, arranges and rearranges the facts in its own order, discards what does not fit or reshapes it to fit. The critics may deny this but their treatment of the Old Testament is too well known to need any proof of it. The use of the Redactor is a case in point. This purely imaginary being, unhistorical and unscientific, is brought into requisition at almost every difficulty. It is acknowledged that at times he acts in a manner wholly inexplicable. To assume such a person interpolating names of God, changing names and making explanations to suit the purposes of their hypothesis and

imagination is the very negation of science, notwithstanding their boast of a scientific method. Their minds seem to be in abject slavery to their theory. No reason is more impervious to facts than one preoccupied with a theory which does not agree with these facts. Their mental attitude being biased and partial, their methods are partial and the results very one-sided and untrustworthy. They give more credence to the guesses of some so-called scholar, a clay tablet, a heathen king's boast, or a rude drawing in stone, than to the Scripture record. They feel instinctively that to accept the Bible statements would be the ruin of their hypothesis, and what they call their hard-won historical method. In this their instinct is true. The Bible and their hypothesis are irreconcilable. As their theory must not be interfered with, since it is identical with the truth itself, the Bible must stand aside in the interests of truth.

For this reason they deny all historicity to Genesis 1-11, the stories of Creation, the Fall, the Flood, etc. No theory of naturalistic evolution can possibly admit the truth of these chapters. Likewise, there is but a substratum of truth in the stories of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and Moses. Nearly all legislation is denied to the latter, because it represents too rapid an advance, or a stage too advanced. But is such the case? Centuries before Moses, laws, government, civilization, culture, art, education, religion, temples, ritual and priesthood had flourished in Babylonia and Egypt and were a chief factor in the education of Moses. With all this previous development upon which to build, what objections to ascribing these laws to Moses, who, during the forty years under divine guidance, selected, purified, heightened, and adopted such laws as best served the needs of the people. The development of external laws and customs had preceded Moses, and there is no need to suppose a development afterward in the history of the people. That history records the fitful attempts at the assimilation of these laws. To maintain that they were at first

put in the exact form in which they have come down to us is wholly unnecessary and contrary to certain facts in the records themselves. But to my mind one of the greatest weaknesses of the critical position is, that because there is little or no mention of the laws in the history that follows the death of Moses, therefore these laws could not have existed. To the critic this is one of the strongest arguments in his favor. Now he has found out how to make the history and the laws correspond. But does the non-mention or non-observance of a law prove its non-existence? All history shows that such is not the case. Moreover, the books of Joshua, Judges and Samuel make no pretence at giving a complete detailed history. If non-mention or non-observance were proof of non-existence, then the Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy could not have existed until the return from Exile; for the laws against idolatry were not carried out until then. Apply this same method of reasoning to laws in general and the most absurd results will follow. The Decalogue could never have existed, for all of its laws are constantly being broken. No New Testament could have existed through the Dark Ages, for almost every precept in it was violated during that period. The facts of life plainly show that men with the law of God in their hands will continually violate them. But why did not Joshua and those succeeding him for several centuries carry out the law of Moses? The answer is obvious. The circumstances did not permit of it, and no one, not even Moses, had any idea of the law being fully observed at once. He looked forward to a time when they should be settled and should have a capital and central sanctuary. Moreover, a large portion of the laws was intended for the priest alone and may have been observed. The laws were flexible and to be fulfilled as the circumstances permitted. If the Book of Deuteronomy could not be observed, the Book of the Covenant could be followed. Changes and modifications were purposely made by Moses to meet the demands of the changing

circumstances. If the non-fulfillment of these laws proved their non-existence, then the Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy were not in existence in the time of Jehoiakim, for idolatry was then rampant.

By its arbitrary methods, Modern Criticism does wholesale violence to the record of the discovery of the Law Book as recorded in 2 Kings 22:8-20. It denies any real discovery, distinctly implies fraud upon the part of the writers, assumes a far too easy deception of the king, the prophetess, the king's counsellors, Jeremiah and the people. It implies a marvelous success in perpetrating this forged document on the people. The writers did evil that good might come, and God seems to have been behind it all and endorsed it. Such a transaction is utterly incredible. "The people would not hear Moses and the prophet, yet they were easily persuaded by a forged Mosaic document." The critics disagree among themselves regarding the authorship of the Book of Deuteronomy. Some maintain it was by the priestly class and some by the prophetic class, but there are insuperable objections to each. They have failed to show why there were so many laws incorporated in it which absolutely contradict a later date and why the Mosaic dress succeeded so well although contradictory to some of the genuinely Mosaic laws.

According to the critics also, Ezra perpetrated a tremendous fraud when he palmed off his completed Code as of Mosaic origin. That the people should accept it as genuinely Mosaic, although it increased their burdens and contradicted many laws previously known as Mosaic, is incredible. That such a people at such a time and under such circumstances could be so easily imposed upon and deceived, and that such a man as Ezra could perform such a colossal fraud and have it all succeed so well, seems inconceivable except by a person whose moral consciousness is dulled or benumbed by some philosophical theory. According to the critics, the authors of Deuteronomy and the Levitical Code not only produced such

intensely religious books and laws, but were at the same time deliberate inventors and falsifiers of history as well as deceivers of the people. What such views imply regarding the character of God who is behind it all we shall consider later.

Space does not permit me to more than refer to the J. E. P. analysis. That certain documents existed and were ultimately combined to make up the five books of Moses no one need doubt. It in no way detracts from their inspiration or authenticity to do so, nor does it in any way deny the essentially Mosaic origin of the legislation. But the J. E. P. analysis on the basis of the different names for God I found to require such an arbitrary handling and artificial manipulation of the text, to need the help of so many Redactors whose methods and motives are wholly inexplicable, with a multitude of exceptions to account for, that I was convinced the analysis could not be maintained. Astruc's clue in Exodus 6:3, which was the starting point for the analysis, cannot be made to decide the time of the use of the names of God, for the text is not perfectly certain. There is considerable difference between the two readings, "was known," "made myself known." Even if God had not previously revealed Himself by the name Jahveh, that does not prove the name unknown or that God was not known by that name. And even if he had so revealed Himself, the earlier record would not be less authentic, for they were either written or rewritten and edited after the revelation to Moses in the light of a fuller revelation. Thus it was made perfectly clear that El, Elohim, El-Elyon, El-Shaddai, were identical with Jahveh.

The methods of the critics in regarding the earlier histories as little more than fiction and invention, to palm off certain laws as genuinely Mosaic, found some lodgment in my mind for a time. But the more I considered it, the more I was convinced that it was the critics who were the inventors and falsifiers. They were the ones who had such a facile imagination, they could "manufacture" history at their "green

tables" to suit their theories and were doing so fast and loose. They could create nations and empires out of a desert, and like the alchemists of the Middle Ages with their magic wand, transform all things into their own special and favorite metal. To charge the Scripture writers with this invention and falsification is grossly to malign them and slander the God that wrought through them. The quality of their products does not lend countenance to such a view, and it is abhorrent to the Christian consciousness. Such a conception cannot be long held by any whose moral and religious natures have not been dulled by their philosophical presuppositions. The habit of discarding the Books of Chronicles, because they give no history of Northern Israel, lay considerable emphasis upon the temple and priesthood, pass over the faults and sins of the kings, etc., and are therefore a biased and untrustworthy history, has appeared to me an aberration from common sense, and is scarcely credible among men of such intelligence. When the compiler of Chronicles covers the same history of Kings, he agrees with these histories substantially, though varying in some minor details. If he is reliable in this material, why not in the other material, not found in Kings? The real reason is that he records many facts about the temple and its services which do not fit in with the critics' hypothesis, and therefore something must be done to discredit the Chronicler and get rid of his testimony.

But my third reason for rejecting the critical standpoint is

III. THE SPIRIT OF THE MOVEMENT

Grant that there is a genuine scientific interest underlying it all, the real question is, what is the standpoint of the scientific mind which investigates. What is authoritative with him? His philosophical theory and working hypothesis, or his religious faith? In other words, does his *religion* or *philosophy* control his thinking? Is it reason or faith that is supreme? Is his authority human or divine? There is no

question here of having one without the other, that is, having faith without reason, for that is impossible. The question is, which is supreme? For some time I thought one could hold these views of the Old Testament and still retain his faith in evangelical Christianity. I found, however, that this could be done only by holding my philosophy in check and within certain limits. It could not be rigorously applied to all things. Two supreme things could not exist in the mind at the same time. If my theories were supreme, then I was following human reason, not faith, and was a rationalist to that extent. If the presuppositions of my religious faith were supreme and in accordance with the Biblical presuppositions and beliefs, then my philosophy must be held in abeyance. The fundamentals of our religious faith, as known in the Bible and history, are a belief in divine revelation, the miraculous birth, the life and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the God-Man. Inseparable from these there is also the fact of a supernatural power in regeneration. The philosophy of the critics cannot consistently make room for these. Thus the real question becomes one of authority, viz.: shall the scientific hypothesis be supreme in my thinking, or the presuppositions of the Christian faith? If I make my philosophical viewpoint supreme, then I am compelled to construe the Bible and Christianity through my theory and everything which may not fit into that theory must be rejected. This is the actual standpoint of the critic. His is a philosophical rather than a religious spirit. Such was Gnosticism in the early centuries. It construed Christ and Christianity through the categories of a Graeco-Oriental philosophy and thus was compelled to reject some of the essentials of Christianity. Such was the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages, which construed Christianity through the categories of the Aristotelian Logic and the Neo-platonic Philosophy. Such is the Higher Criticism which construes everything through the hypothesis of evolution. The spirit of the movement is thus essentially scholastic and rationalistic.

It became more and more obvious to me that the movement was entirely intellectual, an attempt in reality to intellectualize all religious phenomena. I saw also that it was a partial and one-sided intellectualism, with a strong bias against the fundamental tenets of Biblical Christianity. Such a movement does not produce that intellectual humility which belongs to the Christian mind. On the contrary, it is responsible for a vast amount of intellectual pride, an aristocracy of intellect with all the snobbery which usually accompanies that term. Do they not exactly correspond to Paul's word, "vainly puffed up in his fleshly mind and not holding fast the head, etc.?" They have a splendid scorn for all opinions which do not agree with theirs. Under the spell of this sublime contempt they think they can ignore anything that does not square with their evolutionary hypothesis. The center of gravity of their thinking is in the theoretical not in the religious, in reason, not in faith. Supremely satisfied with its self-constituted authority, the mind thinks itself competent to criticise the Bible, the thinking of all the centuries, and even Jesus Christ Himself. The followers of this cult have their full share of the frailties of human nature. Rarely, if ever, can a thoroughgoing critic be an evangelist, or even evangelistic; he is educational. How is it possible for a preacher to be a power for God, whose source of authority is his own reason and convictions? The Bible can scarcely contain more than good advice for such a man.

I was much impressed with their boast of having all scholarship on their side. It is very gratifying to feel oneself abreast with the times, up to date, and in the front rank of thought. But some investigation and consideration led me to see that the boast of scholarship is tremendously overdone. Many leading scholars are with them, but a majority of the most reverent and judicious scholars are not. The arrogant boasts of these people would be very amusing, if they were not so influential. Certainly most of the books put forth of late by

Old Testament scholars are on their side, but there is a formidable list on the other side and it is growing larger every day. Conservative scholarship is rapidly awakening, and, while it will retain the legitimate use of the invaluable historical method, will sweep from the field most of the speculations of the critics. A striking characteristic of these people is a persistent ignoring of what is written on the other side. They think to kill their antagonist by either ignoring or despising him. They treat their opponents something as Goliath treated David, and in the end the result will be similar. They have made no attempt to answer Robertson's "The Early Religion of Israel;" Orr's "The Problem of the Old Testament;" Wiener's "Studies in Biblical Law" and "Studies in Pentateuchical Criticism," etc. They still treat these books which have undermined the very foundations of their theories with the same magnificent scorn. There is a nemesis in such an attitude.

But the spirit of the critical movement manifests some very doubtful aspects in its practical working out among the pastors and churches. Adherents of this movement accept the spiritual oversight of churches which hold fast to the Biblical view of the Bible, while they know that their own views will undermine many of the most cherished beliefs of the churches. Many try to be critics and conservative at the same time. They would "run with the hare and hunt with the hounds," professing to be in full sympathy with evangelical Christianity while abiding their opportunity to inculcate their own views, which, as we have seen, is really to forsake the Christian standpoint. The morality of such conduct is, to say the least, very doubtful. It has led to much mischief among the churches and injury to the work. A preacher who has thoroughly imbibed these beliefs has no proper place in an evangelical Christian pulpit. Such a spirit is not according to the spirit of the religion they profess to believe.

But another weighty reason for rejecting the Higher Criticism is

IV. A CONSIDERATION OF ITS RESULTS

Ten or twenty years ago these scholars believed their views would immensely advance the cause of Christianity and true religion. They are by no means so sure of that now. It is not meeting with the universal acceptance they anticipated. Making a mere hypothesis the supreme thing in our thinking, we are forced to construe everything accordingly. Thus the Bible, the Christ and the religious experiences of men are subjected to the same scientific analysis. Carry this out to its logical conclusion and what would be the result? There would be all science and no religion. In the array of scientific facts all religion would be evaporated. God, Christ, the Bible, and all else would be reduced to a mathematical or chemical formula. This is the ideal and goal of the evolutionary hypothesis. The rationalist would rejoice at it, but the Christian mind shrinks with horror from it. The Christian consciousness perceives that an hypothesis which leads to such results is one of its deadliest foes.

Another danger also arises here. When one makes his philosophy his authority, it is not a long step until he makes himself his own god. His own reason becomes supreme in his thinking and this reason becomes his lord. This is the inevitable logic of the hypothesis mentioned, and some adherents of the school have taken this step. They recognize no authority but their own moral instincts and philosophical reason. Now, as the evolution theory makes all things exist only in a state of change, of flux, or of becoming, God is therefore changing and developing, the Bible and Christ will be outgrown, Christianity itself will be left behind. Hence, there is no *absolute* truth, nothing in the moral religious world is fixed or certain. All truth is in solution; there is no precipitate upon which we can rely. There is no *absolute* standard of Ethics, no *authority* in religion, every one is practically his own god. Jesus Christ is politely thanked for His services in

the past, gallantly conducted to the confines of His world and bowed out as He is no longer needed and His presence might be very troublesome to some people. Such a religion is the very negation of Christianity, is a distinct reversion to heathenism. It may be a cultured and refined heathenism with a Christian veneer, but yet a genuine heathenism.

I am far from saying that all adherents of this school go to such lengths, but why do they not? Most of them had an early training under the best conservative influences which inculcated a wholesome reverence for the Bible as an authority in religion and morals. This training they can never fully outgrow. Many of them are of a good, sturdy religious ancestry, of rigid, conservative training and genuine religious experience. Under these influences they have acquired a strong hold upon Christianity and can never be removed from it. They hold a theoretical standpoint and a religious experience together, failing, as I believe, to see the fundamental contradiction between them. Slowly the Christian consciousness and Christian scholarship are asserting themselves. Men are beginning to see how irreconcilable the two positions are and there will be the inevitable cleavage in the future. Churches are none too soon or too seriously alarmed. Christianity is beginning to see that its very existence is at stake in this subtle attempt to do away with the supernatural. I have seen the Unitarian, the Jew, the free thinker, and the Christian who has imbibed critical views, in thorough agreement on the Old Testament and its teachings. They can readily hobnob together, for the religious element becomes a lost quantity; the Bible itself becomes a plaything for the intellect, a merry-go-round for the mind partially intoxicated with its theory.

As has been already intimated, one of the results of the critical processes has been to rearrange the Bible according to its own point of view. This means that it has to a large extent set it aside as an authority. Such a result is serious enough, but a much more serious result follows. This is

the reflection such a Bible casts upon the character and methods of God in His revelation of Himself to men. It will scarcely be doubted by even a radical critic, that the Bible is the most uplifting book in the world, that its religious teachings are the best the world has known. If such be the case, it must reflect more of God's character and methods than any other book. The writers themselves must exemplify many of the traits of the God they write about. What then must be the methods of a holy and loving God? If He teaches men truth by parable or history or illustration, the one essential thing about these parables or histories is that they be true to life or history or nature. Can a God who is absolutely just and holy teach men truths about Himself by means of that which is false? Men may have taught truth by means of falsehoods and other instruments and perhaps succeeded, but God can hardly be legitimately conceived of as using any such means. Jesus Christ taught the greatest of truths by means of parables, illustrations, etc., but every one was true to life or nature or history. The Christian consciousness, which is the highest expression of the religious life of mankind, can never conceive of Jesus as using that which was in itself untrue, as a vehicle to convey that which is true. In like manner if God had anything to do with the Old Testament, would He make use of mere myths, legends, sagas, invented and falsified history, which have no foundation in fact and are neither true to nature, history nor life? Will God seek to uplift mankind by means of falsehood? Will He sanction the use of such dishonest means and pious frauds, such as a large part of the Pentateuch is, if the critics are right? Could He make use of such means for such a holy purpose and let His people feed on falsehood for centuries and centuries and deceive them into righteousness? Falsehood will not do God's will; only truth can do that. Is there nothing in the story of creation, of the fall, the flood, the call and promise to Abraham, the life of Jacob and Joseph and the great work of Moses? If all these

things are not true to fact or to life, then God has been an arch-deceiver and acts on the Jesuit maxim, "The end justifies the means." This would apply to the finding of the Law in Josiah's time, and the giving of the law under Ezra. That such a lot of spurious history, deceptive inventions and falsifying history should achieve such a success is most astonishing. Is it possible that a holy God should be behind all this and promote righteousness thereby? This surely is conniving at evil and using methods unworthy of the name of God. To say that God was shut up to such a method is preposterous. Such a conception of God as is implied in the critical position is abhorrent to one who believes in a God of truth.

Perhaps the Book of Daniel at the hands of the critic best illustrates this point. No one can deny the religious quality of the book. It has sublime heights and depths and has had a mighty influence in the world. No one can read the book carefully and reverently without feeling its power. Yet according to the modern view the first six or seven chapters have but a grain of truth in them. They picture in a wonderfully vivid manner the supernatural help of God in giving Daniel power to interpret dreams, in delivering from the fiery furnace, in saving from the lion's mouth, smiting King Nebuchadnezzar, etc. All this is high religious teaching, has had a great influence for good and was intended for a message from God to encourage faith. Yet, according to the critics these events had no foundation in fact, the supernatural did not take place, the supposed facts upon which these sublime religious lessons are based could never have occurred. Yet the God of truth has used such a book with such teaching to do great good in the world. He thus made abundant use of fiction and falsehood. According to this view He has also been deceiving the best people of the world for millenniums, using the false and palming it off as true. Such a God may be believed in by a critic, but the Christian consciousness revolts at it. It is worthy of a Zeus, or perhaps the Demiurge

of Marcion, but He is not the God of Israel, not the God and Father of Jesus Christ. "But," says the critic, "the religious lessons are great and good." Are they? Can a story or illustration or parable teach good religious lessons when it is in itself essentially untrue to nature, history and life? To assert such a thing would seem to imply a moral and religious blindness that is scarcely credible. It is true there are many grave difficulties in the book of Daniel, but are they as great as the moral difficulty implied in the critical view?

The foregoing embody my chief reasons for rejecting the position of the Critical School with which I was once in sympathy. Their positions are not merely vagaries, they are essentially attempts to undermine revelation, the Bible and evangelical Christianity. If these views should ultimately prevail, Christianity will be set aside for what is known as the New Religion, which is no religion, but a philosophy. All critics believe that traditional Christianity will largely, if not altogether, give place to the modern view, as it is called. But we maintain that traditional Christianity has the right of way. It must and will be somewhat modified by the conception of a developing revelation and the application of the historical method, but must prevail in all its essential features. It has a noble ancestry and a glorious history. The Bible writers are all on its side; the bulk of Jewish scholars of the past are in the procession; it has Jesus, the Son of God, in its ranks, with the apostles, prophets, the martyrs, the reformers, the theologians, the missionaries and the great preachers and evangelists. The great mass of God's people are with it. I prefer to belong to that goodly company rather than with the heathen Porphyry, the pantheistic Spinoza, the immoral Astruc, the rationalistic Reuss, Vatke, Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen, with a multitude of their disciples of all grades. Theirs is a new traditionalism begun by those men and handed down to others in England and America. Most of these disciples owe their religious life and training almost entirely to the tradi-

tional view. The movement has quickened study of the Old Testament, has given a valuable method, a great many facts, a fresh point of view, but its extravagancies, its vagaries, its false assumptions and immoralities will in time be sloughed by the Christian consciousness as in the past it has sloughed off Gnosticism, Pantheism, Scholasticism and a host of other philosophical or scientific fads and fancies.

HIEBERT LIBRARY
3 6877 00044 3019

DATE DUE

DEMCO 38-297